

Section 10. Aid to Families With Dependent Children and Related

Programs (Title IV-A)

BACKGROUND AND ELIGIBILITY

Aid to dependent children was established by the Social Security Act of 1935 as a cash grant program to enable States to aid needy children without fathers. Renamed Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the program provides cash welfare payments for (1) needy children who have been deprived of parental support or care because their father or mother is absent from the home continuously, is incapacitated, is deceased or is unemployed, and (2) certain others in the household of such child. Currently all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands operate an AFDC program. Although 1988 legislation provided that American Samoa could participate in the AFDC program, as of April 1994 it had not chosen to do so.

States define ``need,' ' set their own benefit levels, establish (within Federal limitations) income and resource limits, and administer the program or supervise its administration. Federal funds currently pay from 50 to about 80 percent of the AFDC benefit costs in a State (55 percent on average) and 50 percent of administrative costs.

Table 10-1 summarizes the trends of several key elements in the AFDC program from 1970 to 1993. Between 1970 and 1993, the number of recipients has increased 91 percent, from 7.4 million in 1970 to 14.1 million in 1993. The number of families has increased over the same time period 163 percent, from 1.9 million to 5.0 million. AFDC benefit expenditures have

increased 44 percent, after adjusting for inflation, from \$15.5 billion in 1970 to \$22.3 billion in 1993. Administrative costs remained almost the same in both 1970 and 1993, after adjusting for inflation, at nearly \$3.0 billion. AFDC administrative costs were 19 percent of AFDC benefit payments in 1970 and 13 percent in 1993. After accounting for inflation, the average monthly AFDC benefit per family was \$676 in 1970 and \$373 in 1993, a 45 percent reduction.

TABLE

10-1.--SUMMARY OF KEY AFDC PROGRAM ELEMENTS

[In

dollars, except for caseload numbers]

1970	1975	1980	1985	1988	1990
1991	1992	1993			

Total AFDC

Benefit expenditures (millions).....

4,082	8,153	11,540	14,580	16,663
-------	-------	--------	--------	--------

18,539	20,356	22,240	22,286
--------	--------	--------	--------

1993\1\				
---------	--	--	--	--

15,496	22,586	20,700	19,627	20,437
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

20,671	21,606	22,911	22,286
--------	--------	--------	--------

Federal share (millions).....

2,187	4,625	6,448	7,817	9,125
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

10,149	11,165	12,252	12,270
--------	--------	--------	--------

1993\1\				
---------	--	--	--	--

8,303	12,813	11,566	10,523	11,192
-------	--------	--------	--------	--------

11,316	11,850	12,621	12,270		
Administrative cost (millions).....					
758	1,082	1,479	1,779	2,353	2,661
2,673	2,764	2,956			
1993\1\.....					
2,878	2,997	2,653	2,395	2,886	
2,967	2,837	2,847	2,956		
Federal share (millions).....					
572	552	750	890	1,194	1,358
1,373	1,422	1,518			
1993\1\.....					
2,171	1,529	1,345	1,198	1,464	
1,514	1,457	1,465	1,518		
Average monthly numbers (thousands):					
Families.....					
1,909	3,269	3,574	3,692	3,748	
3,974	4,375	4,769	4,981		
Recipients.....					
7,429	11,067	10,597	10,813	10,920	
11,460	12,595	13,625	14,144		
Children.....					
5,494	7,821	7,220	7,165	7,326	
7,755	8,515	9,225	9,539		
Average family size.....					
4.0	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9
2.9	2.9	2.9			
Average montly benefit per family.....					
178	208	269	329	370	389
388	389	373			
1993\1\.....					
676	576	483	443	454	434
412	401	373			

AFDC-Basic and AFDC-UP

Benefit expenditures (millions), 1993:\1\

Total AFDC.....					
15,496	22,586	20,700	19,627	20,437	
20,671	21,606	22,911	22,286		
AFDC-Basic.....					
14,620	21,583	19,457	17,532	18,695	

19,021	19,667	20,728	19,990		
AFDC-UP.....					
877	1,003	1,243	2,095	1,742	1,650
1,939	2,183	2,298			
Average monthly families (thousands):					
Total AFDC.....					
1,909	3,269	3,574	3,692	3,748	
3,974	4,375	4,769	4,981		
AFDC-Basic.....					
1,831	3,168	3,433	3,431	3,538	
3,770	4,107	4,447	4,622		
AFDC-UP.....					
78	101	141	261	210	204
268	322	359			
Average monthly benefit per family--1993:\1\					
Total AFDC.....					
676	576	483	443	454	434
412	401	373			
AFDC-Basic.....					
665	568	472	426	440	420
399	388	360			
AFDC-UP.....					
937	827	735	669	691	674
603	565	533			

 \1\Adjusted for inflation using CPI-U (fiscal year).
 Note: AFDC benefit expenditures have not been reduced by
 child support enforcement collections and do not include
 foster care payments; AFDC enrollment
 figures do not include foster care children.
 Source: Department of Health and Human Services,
 Administration for Children and Families and Congressional
 Research Service.

Regardless of the method used to express the need
 standard,
 the Social Security Act requires that the standard be
 uniformly
 applied within the State or locality to all families in

similar
circumstances. While participating States must comply with
the
terms of the Federal legislation, the AFDC program is
voluntary, and States traditionally have been at liberty to
pay
as little or as much in benefits as they choose. In
addition to
State variations in AFDC eligibility and benefit levels,
the
benefit levels vary primarily by family size and sometimes
by
shelter costs.

Eligibility for AFDC ends on a child's 18th birthday,
or at
State option upon a child's 19th birthday if the child is a
full-time student in a secondary or technical school and
may
reasonably be expected to complete the program before he or
she
reaches age 19.

While optional prior to October 1, 1990, States that
operate AFDC programs are now required to offer AFDC to
children in two-parent families who are needy because of
the
unemployment of one of their parents (AFDC-UP). Eligibility
for
AFDC-UP is limited to those families in which the principal
wage earner is unemployed but has a history of work. States
that did not have an unemployed parent program as of
September
26, 1988 may limit benefits under the AFDC-UP program to as
few
as 6 months in any 13-month period.

The Family Support Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-485)
substantially revised the education and training
requirements
of the AFDC program. As of October 1, 1990, States are
required
to have a job opportunities and basic skills training
(JOBS)

program. The new program is designed to help needy families with children avoid long-term welfare receipt. The JOBS program replaces the work incentive (WIN) and WIN demonstration programs, and incorporates other work requirements of previous law. In addition, the JOBS program must include an educational component. States are required to enroll virtually all able-bodied persons whose youngest child is at least age 3, provided State resources are available.

Families receiving AFDC are automatically eligible for Medicaid. The Family Support Act also requires that States provide transitional Medicaid benefits for those who lose AFDC eligibility as a result of increased hours of, or increased income from, employment or as a result of the loss of earnings disregards.

The Family Support Act requires that States guarantee child care if it is decided that child care is necessary for an individual's employment or participation in education or training activities (including participation in the JOBS program) approved by the State, and requires that transitional child care be provided for families who lose AFDC eligibility as a result of increased hours of, or increased income from, employment or as a result of the loss of earnings disregards.

The AFDC statute also includes entitlement funds to the States to provide child care to families who are not receiving AFDC who need such care in order to work and would otherwise be at risk of becoming eligible for AFDC.

Finally, Federal law requires AFDC mothers to assign

their
child support rights to the State and to cooperate with
welfare
officials in establishing the paternity of a child and in
obtaining support payments from the father.

TREATMENT OF INCOME AND RESOURCES

Federal AFDC law requires that all income received by
an
AFDC recipient or applicant be counted against the AFDC
grant
except that income explicitly excluded by definition or
deduction. Moreover, AFDC law requires that certain persons
be
considered part of the AFDC assistance unit and that part
of
the income of certain other persons be counted in
determining
the AFDC eligibility status and benefit amount.

In 1981, Congress required that a portion of the income
of
a stepparent be counted in determining AFDC eligibility and
benefit amounts. However, in a few States (7 as of October
1,
1990), State law requires that all stepparents assume the
legal
responsibility of a natural or adoptive parent. In those
States
all of the stepparent's income must be counted in
determining
the AFDC eligibility status and/or benefit amount of the
children and spouse.

In 1984, a standard definition of the AFDC assistance
unit
was established for the first time. Under this requirement,
the
parent(s) of a dependent child and any dependent brothers
or
sisters who are in the home are to be included in the AFDC
unit, with eligibility and benefits based on the income and

circumstances of this family unit. SSI recipients, stepsiblings, and children receiving foster care maintenance payments or adoption assistance are excluded from this requirement. In addition, if a minor who is living in the same home as her parents applies for aid as the parent of a needy child, a portion of the income of the minor's parents is to be counted as available to the filing unit.

The law also requires that income from a nonrecurring earned or unearned lump sum payment that exceeds the monthly AFDC need standard must be taken into account in determining AFDC eligibility and/or benefit amount. Lump sum payments in excess of the State's need standard--for the given family size--renders a family ineligible for AFDC for a period of time equal to the lump sum payment divided by the State's monthly need standard.

Unearned income

States are required by Federal law and/or regulations to disregard certain income in determining the eligibility and benefits of families applying for or receiving AFDC.

Unearned

income not counted by the AFDC program includes the following:

the first \$50 of current monthly child support payments received by the family, certain Department of Education grants

and loans to undergraduate students for educational purposes,

loans and grants, such as scholarships, obtained and used under

conditions that preclude their use for current living costs,
the value of Department of Agriculture donated foods, benefits received from Child Nutrition programs or nutrition programs for the elderly, payments to VISTA workers, some payments to certain Indian tribes, any amounts paid by a State welfare agency from State-only funds to meet the needs of AFDC children, if the payments are made under a statutorily-established State program that has been continuously in effect since before January 1, 1979, payments for supporting services or reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses made to volunteers serving as foster grandparents, senior health aides, or senior companions, and Agent Orange settlement payments.

Earned income

States are required by Federal law to disregard certain earned income when determining the amount of benefits to which a recipient family is entitled. States must disregard all the earned income of each dependent child receiving AFDC who is a full-time student or a part-time student who is not a full-time employee and is attending a school, college, university, or vocational training course. States may, for a period of 6 months, disregard all or part of the earned income of a dependent child who is a full-time student and who is applying for AFDC, if and only if the earnings of such child are excluded for such month in determining the family's total income pursuant to the 185 percent gross income eligibility test. States also have the option of disregarding all or

any
part of income derived from Job Training Partnership Act
(JTPA)
programs by a dependent child applying for or receiving
AFDC
(there is a 6-month limit on the disregard of earned
income,
and no limit on unearned income).

With respect to self-employment, ``earned income'' is
defined by Federal regulations as the ``total profit from a
business enterprise, farming, etc., resulting from a
comparison
of the gross receipts with the ``business expenses,'' i.e.,
expenses directly related to producing the goods or
services
and without which the goods or services could not be
produced.
However, under AFDC regulations, items such as
depreciation,
personal business and entertainment expenses, personal
transportation, purchase of capital equipment and payments
on
the principal of loans for capital assets or durable goods
are
not considered business expenses.

Before OBRA of 1981, in order to provide a financial
incentive for recipients to seek and maintain employment,
Federal law required the deduction of an initial \$30 in
monthly
earnings plus one-third of remaining earnings, plus work
expenses (any expenses, including child care costs,
reasonably
attributable to the earning of income). When making an
initial
determination of eligibility, however, only work expenses
were
disregarded.

Amendments in OBRA of 1981 changed the order in which
the
disregards were applied, limited the disregard for work
expenses to \$75 per month, capped the child care disregard

at
\$160 per month per child, and specified that the HHS
Secretary
could lower these sums for part-time work. The \$30 plus
one-
third disregard was limited to a period of 4 consecutive
months; recipients who left AFDC and then returned could
not
again qualify for this disregard for 12 months. States were
prohibited from paying AFDC to any family with a gross
income
above 150 percent of the State's standard of need and were
required to assume that working AFDC recipients received a
monthly earned income tax credit (EITC), if they appeared
eligible for it and regardless of when or if the credit was
actually available. Under prior law, the EITC was counted
only
when received; most AFDC recipients did not receive the
EITC on
a monthly basis. These changes substantially reduced the
amount
of earnings a recipient could have and remain eligible for
an
AFDC payment.

In 1984, Congress further revised these disregards. The
gross income limit was increased to 185 percent of the
State
standard of need, the work expense disregard of \$75 per
month
was applied to both full- and part-time workers, and the
\$30
disregard--originally a part of \$30 and one-third--was
extended
for an additional 8 months beyond the 4-month limit on the
one-
third deduction. The 1984 legislation also returned to
prior
law policy with respect to the earned income tax credit: it
was
to be counted only when actually received.

The Family Support Act of 1988 revised the treatment of

earned income effective October 1, 1989. The work expense disregard is \$90 per month, the maximum child care expense allowance is \$175 per month per child (\$200 for children under age 2), and the child care disregard is now calculated after other disregard provisions have been applied. Furthermore, States are now required to disregard the earned income tax credit in determining eligibility for and benefits under the AFDC program.

Table 10-2 illustrates the impact of the 1981, 1984 and 1988 changes on a mother with two children working full-time at a low wage. Two AFDC benefit standards are illustrated: \$680 represents the AFDC payment standard for a family of three in a high benefit State and \$366 is the payment standard for a three-person family in the median State (January 1994 data).

Several States use a method of paying AFDC that allows working families to retain a greater portion of their AFDC grant as earnings increase. This method of payment, commonly referred to as ``fill-the-gap,'` provides greater financial incentives for families to work than the standard payment method. Under the standard payment method, the AFDC grant is determined by subtracting countable income (e.g., earnings less disregards) from the State's payment standard. (States' AFDC payment standard may be less than the State's AFDC ``need standard'`--the amount a State recognizes as essential for a family to meet basic and special needs.) Some States having AFDC payment standards below their need standard allow families to fill part or all of the gap between the payment and need standard with earnings, before reducing the AFDC grant.

States set a maximum payment below the payment standard, allowing families to only ``fill-the-gap'' up to the payment standard. Many States having AFDC payment standards below their need standard do not use a fill-the-gap policy--they begin to reduce the AFDC grant dollar for dollar, for earnings in excess of the standard earnings disregards. In January 1994, ten States were using some form of ``fill-the-gap': Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, Georgia, Utah, South Dakota, Colorado, Wyoming, and Maine. Working mothers in these States have higher net income at equivalent earnings than mothers living in States with similar AFDC payment levels that do not use a ``fill-the-gap'' payment method.\1\

\1\This information on ``fill-the-gap'' payment was taken from an upcoming report: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Work Incentives and Disincentives in the Welfare System. Gabe, Tom and Gene Falk.

TABLE 10-2.--CALCULATION OF MONTHLY AFDC
BENEFITS FOR A WORKER WITH LOW EARNINGS UNDER PRE-OBRA,
OBRA, AND CURRENT LAW

OBRA (1981)	DEFRA (1984)
Current law (FSA) (1988)	

months	months	months	months	months
months	months	months		

Gross earnings.....					
581	581	581	581	581	581
581	581	581			

```
EITC.....
...      +32
+32  .....  .....  .....  .....  .....
.....
```

	Gross income.....				
581	613	613	581	581	581
581	581	581			

Initial disregards\1\.....					
-30	-105	-75	-105	-105	-75
-120	-120	-90			
One-third of rest.....					
-184	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)
-154	(\2\)	(\2\)			
Child care.....					
-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100
-100	-100	-100			

One-third of rest.....				
(\2\)	-136	(\2\)	-125	(\2\)
(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	
Other expenses.....				
\3\ -70	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)
(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	

Total disregards.....					
384	341	175	330	205	175
374	220	190			

=====					
=====					
Net countable income.....					
197	272	438	251	376	406
207	361	391			
AFDC benefits:					
\$680 payment standard.....					
483	408	242	429	304	274
473	319	289			
\$366 payment standard.....					
169	94	0	115	0	0
159	\4\5	0			

\1\Pre-OBRA: \$30 disregard. OBRA: Standard work expense deduction of \$75 plus \$30 in first 4 months. DEFRA: Standard work expense deduction of \$75 plus \$30 disregard in first 12 months. FSA: Standard work expense deduction of \$90 plus \$30 disregard in first 12 months.

\2\Not applicable.

\3\Itemized work expenses including payroll deductions and transportation.

\4\To receive an AFDC check, the benefit amount must equal at least \$10.

Note.--EITC is only counted in the years that it is shown.

Resources

Allowable resources are limited, by Public Law 97-35, to \$1,000 (or such lower amount as the State may determine) equity value (i.e., market value minus any encumbrances) per family, excluding the home and one automobile if the family member's ownership interest does not exceed a limit chosen by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In addition, States must disregard from countable resources burial plots and funeral agreements for members of the assistance unit. Also, for a limited time, States must exclude real property the family is making a ``good faith'' effort to sell, but only if the family agrees to repay benefits. HHS regulations set \$1,500 or a lower level set by the State as the equity value limit for the automobile and permit States to exclude from countable resources ``basic items essential to day to day living,'' such as clothing and furniture. Previous regulations permitted States to adopt a counted resource limit as high as \$2,000 per family member, but allowed States to consider the home and auto as counted resources.

Neither law nor Federal regulations mention capital equipment as being exempt from the resource requirement. Notwithstanding this, families with a self-employed caretaker relative are potentially eligible for AFDC benefits. The Characteristics of State Plans indicates that about half of the States specifically exclude from the resource limitation farm

machinery, livestock, and tools and equipment essential to employment, livelihood, or income.

MONTHLY REPORTING AND RETROSPECTIVE BUDGETING

AFDC eligibility and benefits are determined monthly. Public Law 97-35 required States to determine eligibility on the basis of the family's circumstances in the current month. Payment amounts were to be determined ``retrospectively''-- on the basis of the family's countable income and resources in the preceding month (or, at the discretion of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the second preceding month). In addition, States were to require recipients to provide monthly reports on income, family composition, and resources. However, the Secretary could waive this requirement if the State demonstrated that it would be cost-beneficial to do so. The only categories of recipients that could not be exempted were those with earned income or a recent work history.

In 1984, Public Law 98-369 revised these monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting requirements. Retrospective budgeting was mandatory only for cases which file a monthly report. Monthly reporting was required for cases with earned income or a recent work history and whenever cost effective.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 gave States the option of specifying which categories of AFDC families, if any, have to file monthly reports. Further, States now have the option to choose to apply retrospective budgeting to any one or

more of the categories to whom the reporting requirement applies.

AFDC BENEFITS UNDER THE UNEMPLOYED PARENTS PROGRAM

The original Social Security Act permitted States to give AFDC only to needy children in one-parent homes, unless the second parent was incapacitated. Then, as now, most AFDC children lived in fatherless homes. For the first 25 years of the program, if a father lost his job and his family became needy, State AFDC programs were forbidden to help the family so long as the father lived at home. In 1961, in an antirecession measure, the law was changed so that families with jobless fathers at home could qualify for AFDC. Since May of that year States were permitted to give AFDC to needy children of unemployed parents.

Effective October 1, 1990, all States that operate AFDC programs are required to provide AFDC to two-parent families who are needy because of the unemployment of the principal wage earner. (The requirement did not take effect until October 1, 1992, for American Samoa, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.) The requirement is repealed September 30, 1998.

States that had an AFDC-UP program as of September 26, 1988, are required to continue operating the program without any time limit on eligibility. Other States have the option to impose such a time limit. In exercising this option, a State may not deny AFDC to a family unless the family has received AFDC under the unemployed parents program in at least 6 of

the
preceding 12 months. As of July 1992, the following States
have

time limits on eligibility: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado,
Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, South Dakota,
Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming.

Like other AFDC families, families receiving AFDC cash
assistance in the unemployed parents program are
automatically

eligible for Medicaid. The Family Support Act of 1988
requires

States electing time-limited benefits to provide Medicaid
to

all members of the family without any time limitation.

At the inception of the AFDC-UP program, States defined
``unemployment,'' and some included in the program families
in

which the principal wage earner worked as much as 35 hours
a

week. Since 1971, Federal regulations have specified that
an

AFDC parent must work fewer than 100 hours in a month to be
classified as unemployed, unless hours are of a temporary
nature for intermittent work and the individual met the
100-

hour rule in the two preceding months and is expected to
meet

it the following month. The Family Support Act of 1988
authorizes eight State or local demonstrations to test a
definition of unemployment that is easier to meet than the
present 100-hour rule, including (if any State or locality
so

requests) at least one demonstration that tests the
elimination

of the 100-hour rule or any other Federal durational
standard.

Projects are currently underway in California, Wisconsin,
and

Utah to demonstrate and evaluate alternative definitions of
unemployment.

Attachment to the labor force is one condition of

eligibility for AFDC-UP. The principal earner must: (1) have 6 or more quarters of work in any 13-calendar-quarter period ending within 1 year prior to application for assistance; or (2) have received or been eligible to receive unemployment compensation within 1 year prior to application for assistance.

A quarter of work is a quarter in which an individual earns at least \$50 or in which the individual participated in the JOBS program. At State option, attendance in elementary or secondary school, vocational or technical training, or participation in JTPA, may be substituted for up to 4 of the 6 required quarters of work. Participation in the WIN program and CWEP prior to October 1990 also count toward the quarter of work requirement.

INTERACTION BETWEEN AFDC AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Medicaid

States must provide Medicaid to families receiving cash assistance under AFDC. Several recent acts require that States extend this categorically needy Medicaid coverage, at regular Federal matching rates, to other groups. The most important of these groups include (1) pregnant women, and children up to age 6, with family incomes up to 133 percent of the poverty level; (2) children born on or after October 1, 1983, with family incomes below the Federal poverty level (this provision is phased in to cover all children up to age 19 by the year 2002);

and (3) certain persons whose family income and resources are below the AFDC standards but who fail to qualify for AFDC for other reasons, such as family structure (these include first-time pregnant women). At their option, States may provide coverage to pregnant women and infants with incomes at or below 185 percent of the Federal poverty level.

When families lose AFDC eligibility, categorical Medicaid eligibility also frequently ends, except under those circumstances outlined above, or if the family qualifies for transitional Medicaid benefits established under Public Law 100-485, the Family Support Act of 1988, which took effect April 1, 1990. As a result of this act, States are required to extend Medicaid coverage for 12 months to families who leave cash assistance due to earnings. During the first 6 months of coverage, the States must provide each family the same Medicaid coverage that the family had while receiving AFDC. States are not permitted to impose premiums for this coverage. States do have a ``Medicaid wrap-around'' option, under which they may use Medicaid funds to pay a family's expenses for premiums, deductibles and coinsurance for any health care coverage offered by the employer of the caretaker relative. The employer coverage would then be treated by the Medicaid program as a third party liability.

During the second 6 months of coverage, the States have a number of options. First, they may limit the scope of the Medicaid coverage to acute care benefits, dropping nursing

home

coverage and other nonacute benefits. Second, States may impose

a monthly premium on families with incomes, less necessary child care expenses, in excess of 100 percent of the Federal

poverty level. The monthly premium on these families could not

exceed 3 percent of gross income. Premiums would be determined

on the basis of quarterly reports from families on earnings and

child care costs. Third, States have the option of offering families the choice of (1) basic Medicaid coverage (either the

same as offered to cash assistance beneficiaries or the more

limited acute care package) or (2) one or more types of alternative coverage. These alternative coverages could include

enrollment in an employer group health plan, a State employee

plan, a State health plan for the uninsured, or a health maintenance organization. Families would always have a choice

of staying with their basic Medicaid coverage, although they

could not elect both the basic Medicaid and one of the alternative coverages. With respect to the basic Medicaid coverage, States would have the same ``Medicaid wrap-around''

option as during the first 6-month period. In general, transitional coverage would terminate if a family no longer had

a child, failed to report earnings on a quarterly basis, failed

to pay any required premium, or fraudulently obtained cash assistance benefits.

Effective October 1, 1990, States are required to extend

cash assistance benefits to two-parent families where the

principal earner is unemployed (AFDC-UP). States that have an AFDC-UP program as of September 26, 1988, are required to continue operating such programs without any time limit on eligibility. Other States will have the option to limit cash assistance benefits to as few as 6 months in any 13-month period. States are required to provide full Medicaid coverage to all members of these families even in months when cash assistance benefits are not paid because of a State-established time limit.

In the mid-1980s, States sought to cover pregnant women and children under the Medicaid program. However, they did not want to raise AFDC benefit levels in order to cover them. Congress thus passed legislation giving States the option of covering pregnant women and children and linking their eligibility to the poverty guidelines rather than receipt of AFDC. To prevent States from reducing AFDC benefits (because the targeted populations could be covered irrespective of the AFDC program), Public Law 100-360 prohibited the Secretary of Health and Human Services from approving a State's Medicaid plan if the State reduced its AFDC payment levels below those that were in effect on May 1, 1988.

Food stamps

Most AFDC families are also eligible for and participate in the food stamp program, which provides an important in-kind

supplement to the cash assistance paid under AFDC. Although food stamp benefits are not counted in determining AFDC eligibility, the food stamp program does consider AFDC payments to be countable income and reduces the food stamp benefit by \$0.30 for each dollar of countable cash income. This interaction between AFDC and the food stamp program has important financial implications for a State which desires to increase the income of its AFDC recipients. Because food stamps are reduced by \$0.30 for each additional \$1 of AFDC income, the State must expend \$1.43 to obtain an effective \$1 increase in AFDC recipients' total income. For a State with a 50 percent matching rate, the State must expend \$0.72 of State-only funds to actually obtain a \$1 increase in recipient income. This would be the typical situation for an AFDC recipient with no earnings.

Table 10-3 illustrates the interaction of various programs for a mother with two children at various earning levels. The example assumes the family lives in Pennsylvania. Calculations are made after the mother has been working for 4 months and lost the disregard of one-third of ``residual'' earnings (those remaining after subtraction of a \$120 standard allowance).

TABLE 10-3.--EARNINGS AND BENEFITS FOR A MOTHER WITH TWO CHILDREN WITH DAYCARE EXPENSES--AFTER 4 MONTHS ON JOB (JANUARY 1994)--(PENNSYLVANIA)

Taxes

Food ``Disposable''					Work
AFDC\1\ State	stamps\2\ expenses\4\ Security income\3\ income	Earnings Medicaid income	Social	Federal	EITC

0.....					0
\$5,052	\$2,496	Yes.....	0	0	
0	0	\5\	\$7,548		
\$2,000.....					\$600
4,892	2,184	Yes.....	\$153	0	0
\$600	\5\	8,923			
\$4,000.....					1,200
3,292	2,304	Yes.....	306	0	0
1,200	\5\	9,290			
\$5,000.....					1,500
2,492	2,364	Yes.....	383	0	0
1,500	\5\	9,473			
\$6,000.....					1,800
1,692	2,424	Yes.....	459	0	0
1,800	\5\	9,657			
\$7,000.....					2,100
892	2,484	Yes.....	536	0	0
2,100	\5\	9,840			
\$8,000.....					2,400
0	2,568	Yes\6\....	612	0	0
2,400	\5\	9,956			
\$9,000.....					2,528
0	2,388	Yes\7\....	689	0	\$4
2,700	\5\	10,523			
\$10,000.....					2,528
0	2,208	No\7\....	765	0	34
3,000	10,937				
\$15,000.....					1,820

0	1,308	No\8\.....	1,148	0	174
4,200		12,606			
\$20,000.....					936
0	0	No.....	1,530	\$58	314
5,200		13,834			
\$30,000.....					0
0	0	No.....	2,295	1,718	594
5,400		19,993			
\$50,000.....					0
0	0	No.....	3,825	5,569	1,154
5,400		34,052			

 \1\Assumes these deductions: \$120 monthly standard allowance (which would drop to \$90 after 1 year on the job) and child care costs equal to 20 percent

of earnings, up to maximum of \$350 for 2 children.

\2\Assumes these deductions: 20 percent of earnings, \$131 monthly standard deduction and child care costs equal to 20 percent of wages, up to maximum of

\$320 for 2 children.

\3\Head of household rates in effect for 1994. The dependent care tax credit reduces tax liability at earnings of \$15,000 and above.

\4\Assumed to equal 10 percent of earnings up to maximum of \$100 monthly, plus child care costs equal to 20 percent of earnings up to a maximum of \$350

for 2 children.

\5\In addition, the benefits from Medicaid could be added, but are not, since the extent to which they increase disposable income is uncertain.

\6\Family would qualify for Medicaid because the mother, by law, would be deemed still an AFDC recipient, even though no AFDC would be paid; her

calculated benefit would be below the minimum amount (\$10 monthly) payable.

\7\Family would qualify for Medicaid for 12 months after leaving AFDC under the 1988 Family Support Act. State must offer Medicaid to all children up to

age 6 whose family income is not above 133 percent of the

Federal poverty guideline (ceiling of \$16,385 for a family of 3 in 1994) and to children

over age 6 born after September 1, 1983 (up to age 10 $\frac{1}{3}$ in January 1994), whose family income is below the poverty guideline (\$12,320 for a family of 3).

\8\After losing her Medicaid transitional benefits, to regain eligibility, mother must spend down on medical expenses to State's medically needy income limit (\$5,604 in January 1994).

Source: Congressional Research Service.

CHART 10-1. DISPOSABLE INCOME AT VARIOUS WAGE LEVELS FOR A FAMILY OF THREE WITH CHILD CARE EXPENSES, PENNSYLVANIA, JANUARY 1994

<CHART 10-1>

\1\Net wages equal earnings plus EITC minus taxes and work expenses.

Source: Committee on Ways and Means.

Child support enforcement

Federal law requires AFDC families (and applicants), as a condition of eligibility for aid, to assign their support rights to the State, to cooperate with the State in establishing the paternity of a child born outside of marriage, and to cooperate with the State in obtaining support payments. Families receiving AFDC benefits automatically qualify (free of charge) for CSE services. Their cases are referred to the CSE

agency. The provision requiring the AFDC applicant or recipient to assign to the State her rights to support covers both current support and any arrears which have accrued, and lasts as long as the family receives AFDC. When the family no longer receives AFDC, the mother or caretaker relative regains her right to collect support, but if there are arrears, the State may claim those arrears up to the amount paid out as AFDC benefits.

Child support payments made on behalf of a child receiving AFDC are supposed to be paid to the CSE agency rather than directly to the family. If the child support collection is insufficient to disqualify the family from receiving AFDC payments, the family receives its full monthly AFDC grant plus (pursuant to the 1984 Deficit Reduction Act) the first \$50 of the child support payment made in the child's behalf for that month. In several States where the need standard exceeds the maximum payment, additional amounts of child support are disregarded. The remainder of that monthly child support payment is distributed to reimburse the State and Federal Governments in proportion to their assistance to the family. If the family's income, including the child support payment, is sufficient to make the family ineligible for AFDC payments, the family's AFDC benefits are ended, and future child support payments are paid directly from the noncustodial parent to the family. (The Federal share of child support collections paid on behalf of AFDC children is used first to pay incentives to States on their AFDC and non-AFDC collections. The

remainder is
used to offset Federal AFDC benefit costs. Neither Federal
law
nor regulations stipulate the use of the States share of
AFDC
child support collections.)

As noted above, some States are required to provide
monthly
supplemental payments to AFDC recipients who have less
disposable income now than they would have had in July 1975
because child support is paid to the CSE agency instead of
directly to the family. States required to pay supplemental
payment are often referred to as ``fill-the-gap'' States.
These
States pay less assistance than their full AFDC need
standard,
and allow recipients to use child support income to make up
all
or part of the difference between the payment made by the
State
and the State's need standard.

Section 402(a)(28) of the Social Security Act requires
States that had a fill-the-gap policy in 1975 and currently
have such a policy, to add to the AFDC benefit all or part
of
the child support collection (the amount which would have
caused no reduction in the AFDC benefit if it had been paid
directly to the family).

Information obtained from the Office of Child Support
Enforcement (June 1990) indicates that seven States that
had
fill-the-gap policies in July 1975 also have them now and
thus
must follow the benefit calculation rules of section 402(a)
(28)
when taking account of child support collections for AFDC
families. They are: Georgia, Maine, Mississippi, South
Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wyoming. Another 13
jurisdictions which had fill-the-gap policies in July 1975,
no
longer have them.

SSI and Social Security

In AFDC, Social Security benefits are treated as unearned income and thus AFDC benefits are reduced by \$1 for each \$1 of OASDI benefits. SSI benefits received by a potential member of an AFDC family are treated differently. This member (both a child or an adult receiving SSI benefits) is not regarded as a part of the AFDC unit. Thus his needs are not taken into account in determining the AFDC benefit level. At the same time, the income and resources of the SSI recipient are also ignored in determining the AFDC benefit.

Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program and

Supportive Services

The Family Support Act of 1988 established a new employment, education and training program for recipients of AFDC. This new program, called the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) training program, replaces the work incentive (WIN) program and other provisions of prior law.

Purpose and administration

The purpose of the JOBS program is to assure that needy families with children obtain the education, training and employment that will help them avoid long-term welfare dependence. Each State is required to have a JOBS program, under a State plan approved by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). States were required to implement the program no later than October 1, 1990. No later

than October 1, 1992, the program must be available in every subdivision of the State where it is feasible to operate the program. Table 10-4 provides information on JOBS programs in the States, based on JOBS State plans as of January 1994. As the first column of the table shows, all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the territories (Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) met the implementation date requirement for JOBS, and many implemented the program early. The table also shows that, as of January 1994, all of the jurisdictions were implementing the program statewide.

The JOBS program is administered at the Federal level by the Assistant Secretary for Children and Families in HHS, and at the State level by the State welfare agency. The State welfare agency may offer services and activities directly, or through arrangements or contracts with Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) administrative entities, State and local educational agencies and with other public agencies or private organizations (including community-based organizations).

Assessment, employability plan, case management, and orientation

The State must make an initial assessment of the education, child care and other supportive service needs as well as the skills, prior work experience, and employability of each JOBS participant, and, on the basis of the assessment, develop

an
employability plan for the participant. The State agency
may
require the participant to enter into an agreement with the
State that specifies the participant's obligations under
the
program, and the activities and services to be provided by
the
State. Table 10-4 shows that 8 States chose to require such
an
agreement (January 1994 data).

The State agency may assign a case manager to each
participant and the participant's family. The case manager
must
be responsible for assisting the family to obtain needed
services to ensure effective participation in the JOBS
program.
Table 10-4 shows that only 2 States--Iowa and Oklahoma--
chose
not to assign a case manager.

The State agency is required to provide certain
information
about the JOBS program and supportive services to
applicants
and recipients. For example, the agency must inform
applicants
and recipients of AFDC of the opportunities for which they
are
eligible under the JOBS program, the obligation of the
State
agency, and the rights, responsibilities and obligations of
participants. The agency must provide detailed information
about day care services and must inform applicants and
recipients of all other supportive services, including
transitional health care benefits (see separate section on
supportive services).

Services and activities

A range of services and activities must be offered by
each

State under the JOBS program; however, States are not required to operate the JOBS program uniformly in all parts of the State. The services and activities a State must offer include:

- (1) education activities, including high school or equivalent education, basic and remedial education to achieve a basic literacy level, and education for individuals with limited English proficiency;
- (2) job skills training;
- (3) job readiness activities;
- (4) job development and job placement; and
- (5) supportive services (see separate section on supportive services).

States are required to offer two of the following four activities: (1) group and individual job search; (2) on-the-job training; (3) work supplementation programs; and (4) community work experience (CWEP) programs or any other work experience program approved by the Secretary. In addition to these activities, States may also offer postsecondary education to JOBS participants. Table 10-4 shows which of these activities the individual States are offering, as of January 1994.

When an individual age 20 or over who does not have a high school diploma (or equivalent) is required to participate in the JOBS program, the State agency must include education services as a component unless (1) the individual demonstrates a basic literacy level, or (2) the employability plan identifies a long-term employment goal that does not require a high school diploma.

Following is a more detailed discussion of the Federal requirements for job search, CWEP, and work supplementation programs.

Job search.--States may require AFDC applicants and recipients to participate in a job search program beginning at the time of application. States may require up to 8 weeks of job search for applicants, and may, in addition, require up to 8 weeks of job search for AFDC recipients each year. This means that in the first year, up to 16 weeks of job search may be required, with 8 weeks per year thereafter. Additional job search activities may not be required by the State of an individual unless they are in combination with some other education, training or employment activity which is designed to improve the individual's prospects for employment. In no event may a State require an individual to participate in more than 3 weeks of job search before the State conducts an employability assessment for that individual. Finally, job search cannot be treated for any purpose as an activity under the JOBS program if an individual has participated in job search for 4 out of the preceding 12 months.

Community work experience.--The purpose of a CWEP program is to provide experience and training for individuals not otherwise able to obtain employment. CWEP programs must be designed to improve the employability of participants through actual work experience and training and to enable individuals employed under CWEP programs to move into regular employment. CWEP programs must be limited to projects which serve a useful, public purpose in fields such as health, social service,

environmental protection, education, urban and rural development and redevelopment, welfare, recreation, public facilities, public safety and day care.

A State electing to operate a CWEP program must ensure that the maximum number of hours that any individual may be required to work under the CWEP program is no greater than the number of hours derived by dividing the total AFDC benefit by the Federal minimum wage (or, if greater, the State minimum wage). Any AFDC benefit amount for which the State receives reimbursement through child support collection cannot be taken into account in determining the maximum number of hours that individuals may be required to work.

After an individual has been assigned to a CWEP position for 9 months, the individual cannot be required to continue in that assignment unless the maximum number of hours of work is no greater than the cash benefit (excluding child support) divided by the rate of pay for individuals employed in the same or similar occupations by the same employer at the same site.

At the conclusion of each CWEP assignment, but, in any event, after each 6 months of participation in CWEP, the State agency must provide a reassessment, and revision, as appropriate, of the individual's employability plan.

Work supplementation.--Under a work supplementation program, a State reserves the amount that would have been payable to an AFDC family and uses the amount instead to provide and subsidize a job for the family. Recipients may be placed in jobs offered by private as well as nonprofit

employers. The work supplementation is an alternative to an AFDC payment. Under JOBS, States may make work supplementation

either mandatory or voluntary, and States are required to provide Medicaid to work supplementation participants.

States operating a work supplementation program may adjust the level of their AFDC standard of need in order to carry out

the program, and need standards may vary from one area of the

State to another. Need standards may also vary among recipient

categories, to the extent that the State determines the variation to be appropriate on the basis of the ability of the

recipient to participate in the work supplementation program.

States are able to make further adjustments to amounts paid to

different categories of AFDC recipients participating in work

supplementation in order to offset increases in benefits from

non-AFDC means-tested programs.

States are permitted to reduce or eliminate the amount of

earned income disregards for families participating in a work

supplementation program, and are permitted to offer the \$30 plus one-third earned income disregard for up to 9 months for

participants.

Federal funding under the program is limited for each participant to the aggregate of 9 months worth of the maximum

AFDC grant (unreduced by earned income disregards or changes to

the need standard) the participant family otherwise would have

received were it not participating in the work

supplementation
program and had no income (or less if the person
participates
for fewer than 9 months).

Participation requirements

To the extent resources are available, a State must
require
non-exempt AFDC recipients to participate in the JOBS
program.
Exempt applicants and recipients may participate on a
voluntary
basis. Exempt recipients would be those who are: (1) ill,
incapacitated, or of advanced age; (2) needed in the home
because of the illness or incapacity of another family
member
(who need not be a member of the AFDC unit); (3) the parent
or
other relative of a child under age 3 who is personally
providing care for the child (or, if provided in the State
plan, any age that is less than 3 but not less than 1); (4)
employed 30 or more hours a week; (5) a child under age 16
or
attending, full time, an elementary, secondary or
vocational
school; (6) a woman who is in at least the second trimester
of
pregnancy; or (7) residing in an area where the program is
not
available. Table 10-3 shows that most States exempt
recipients
with a child under age 3 who are providing care for the
child.

The 1988 law includes certain limitations on
participation.
The parent of a child under age 6 (but older than the age
for
an exemption) who is personally providing care for the
child
may be required to participate only if child care is

guaranteed
and required participation is limited to no more than 20
hours
per week. In the case of an AFDC-UP family, the exemption
relating to age of child may apply to only one parent,
except
that the State may require both parents to participate if
child
care is guaranteed.

There are certain special requirements under JOBS
related
to education. To the extent the JOBS program is available
and
State resources permit, a State must require a custodial
parent
under age 20 who has not completed high school (or the
equivalent), including a parent who is not otherwise
required
to participate in JOBS solely because of the exclusion
relating
to providing care for a young child, to participate in an
educational activity. Even though such a parent is
providing
care for a child under 6 years of age, the State agency may
require the parent to participate in the educational
activity
on a full-time basis. Alternative work or training
activities
may be provided if the parent fails to make progress in an
educational activity, or if an educational assessment
determines that participation in an educational activity is
inappropriate. Participation in alternative activities is
limited to 20 hours per week.

If an individual is attending school or a course of
vocational training, not less than half time, at the time
he or
she would otherwise begin to participate in the JOBS
program,
and making satisfactory progress, the attendance may meet
the
participation requirement for the individual, but the costs

of
the school or training are not eligible for Federal
reimbursement.

Certain minimum participation standards are established
for
fiscal years 1990 through 1995 for the AFDC caseload.
States
face a reduced Federal match if those participation
standards
are not met. In fiscal year 1990, at least 7 percent of the
nonexempt caseload in each State must participate in the
JOBS
program in any month. The minimum participation rates in
subsequent years are 7 percent in fiscal year 1991, 11
percent
in fiscal years 1992-1993, 15 percent in fiscal year 1994,
and
20 percent in fiscal year 1995.

At least one parent in each AFDC-UP family must
participate
at least 16 hours a week in a work activity, but, with
respect
to CWEP, not more hours than the minimum wage equivalent
based
on the welfare payment less the portion of the payment
reimbursed to the State by child support. Participation
must be
in work supplementation, community work experience or other
work experience program, on-the-job training, or a State-
designed work program approved by the Secretary. The
percentage
of AFDC-UP families required to meet this work requirement
is
40 percent in fiscal year 1994, 50 percent in fiscal year
1995,
60 percent in fiscal year 1996, and 75 percent in fiscal
year
1997 and fiscal year 1998 (calculated so that, on average,
these percentages of the caseload would be participating in
each month of the year). A State may substitute
participation

in an educational program in the case of a parent under age 25 who has not completed high school.

Targeting of JOBS funds

As described in detail later, Federal matching for JOBS program costs is available as a capped entitlement. The JOBS

program includes incentives for States to target funds toward

certain populations. States face a reduced Federal match unless

55 percent of JOBS funds is spent on the following populations:

(1) families in which the custodial parent is under age 24 and

has not completed high school or has little or no work experience in the preceding year; (2) families in which the youngest child is within 2 years of being ineligible for assistance because of age; (3) families who have received assistance for 36 or more months during the preceding 60-month

period; and (4) applicants who have received AFDC for any 36 of

the 60 months immediately preceding application. Volunteers must be given first consideration within target groups.

Funding of JOBS and supportive services

Federal matching for JOBS program costs is available as a

capped entitlement limited to \$600 million in fiscal year 1989,

\$800 million in fiscal year 1990, \$1 billion in fiscal year 1991, 1992 and 1993, \$1.1 billion in fiscal year 1994, \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 1995, and \$1.0 billion a year thereafter. The Federal match is 90 percent for expenditures up

to the amount allotted to the States for the WIN program in fiscal year 1987. Of additional amounts, the Federal match

is
at the Medicaid rate, with a minimum Federal match of 60 percent, for nonadministrative costs and for personnel costs
for full-time staff working on the JOBS program. The match for
other administrative costs is 50 percent. The Federal match for
JOBS is reduced to 50 percent unless (1) 55 percent of funds
are spent on certain target populations, and (2) the States meet participation rate requirements. The entitlement cap for
JOBS is allocated as follows: States receive an amount equal to
their WIN allotment for fiscal year 1987 (\$126 million for all
States) and the remainder is allocated on the basis of each State's relative number of adult recipients of AFDC.
Federal
program funds may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds for
existing services and activities.

Child care during participation in JOBS and for employment
is reimbursed as a separate, open-ended entitlement at the Medicaid matching rate. Transportation and other work-related
expenses are reimbursed at a rate of 50 percent and are included among those expenditures subject to the JOBS entitlement cap.

Table 10-5 provides information on Federal allocations to
the States for the JOBS program for fiscal years 1991 through
1993, along with information on the amount of these funds States have expended and obligated. The table also includes information on federally reimbursed expenditures for child care. According to HHS, total Federal and State expenditures
for the JOBS program (not including child care) equaled

\$1.006
billion for fiscal year 1992.

Supportive and transitional services

State agencies must guarantee child care for a recipient if the care is necessary for the individual to work. In addition, the State must guarantee child care for education and training activities, including participation in the JOBS program, if the State approves the activity and determines that the individual is participating satisfactorily. The State agency must also guarantee child care to the extent the care is necessary for an individual's employment in any case where a family has ceased to receive AFDC assistance as a result of increased hours of, or increased income from, employment or as a result of the loss of earnings disregards. Transitional child care is limited to a period of 12 months after the last month for which the family actually received AFDC assistance. (AFDC child care assistance programs are described in more detail in section 12.)

The State must provide payment or reimbursement for necessary transportation and other work-related expenses, including other work-related supportive services, that the State determines are necessary to enable an individual to participate in JOBS. Federal matching is 50 percent subject to the overall JOBS funding cap (see section on Federal and State expenditures for JOBS). There is no Federal limit on the amount

of reimbursement with respect to an individual.

TABLE 10-4.--SUMMARY OF
JOBS PROGRAMS FROM STATE PLANS: JANUARY 1994\1\

Exemption from	Optional
participation if	
Require agency	
State	Name of program
\2\ child under	education? Any
Assign case	participant
age--\3\	limits?
contract?	manager?

Alabama.....	JOBS.....	OJT, alt. work
exp., JS.	Yes; 2 year limit...	
Yes.....	No	

Alaska.....	JOBS.....	OJT, alt. work
exp.,	Yes; 30 consecutive	
Yes.....	No	

		JS, other ed.
&	months limit.	
		training.

Arizona.....	JOBS.....	OJT, CWEP,
JS..... 2.....	Yes; 2 year limit...	
Yes.....	No	

Arkansas.....	Project Success.....	Alt. work exp.,
JS.. 1.....	Yes; 4 year limit...	
Yes.....	No	

California.....	GAIN.....	OJT, work
supp.,	Yes; 2 year limit...	
Yes.....	Yes	

CWEP, JS.

Colorado..... New Directions..... OJT, work
supp., 1..... Yes; 24 month limit.
Yes..... No

CWEP, JS.

Connecticut..... JOBS..... OJT,
JS..... 2..... Yes; 2 years; 3
Yes..... No

years for certified

programs.

Delaware..... First Step..... OJT, CWEP,
JS..... Yes.....
Yes..... No

District of Columbia ARC..... OJT, alt. work
exp., Yes; 2 year limit...
Yes..... No

JS.

Florida..... Project Independence OJT, work
supp., Yes; 4 year limit...
Yes..... No

CWEP, alt.

work

exp., JS.

Georgia..... PEACH..... OJT, CWEP, alt.
work Yes; 28 month limit.
Yes..... No

exp., JS.

Guam..... JOBS..... OJT, CWEP,
JS..... Yes.....
Yes..... No

Hawaii..... JOBS..... OJT, CWEP, alt.
work Yes.....
Yes..... No

exp., alt.
education, JS,
other ed. &
training.

Idaho..... JOBS..... OJT, alt. work
exp., Yes; 4 year limit...
Yes..... No

& JS, other ed.
 & training.
 Illinois..... Project Chance..... OJT, work
 supp., Yes; no limits.....
 Yes..... No
 work CWEP, alt.
 other ed. exp., JS,
 & training.
 Indiana..... IMPACT: JOBS..... OJT, CWEP,
 JS..... Yes.....
 Yes..... No
 Iowa..... Promise JOBS..... OJT, CWEP, alt.
 work Yes; 30 month limit
 No..... No
 other exp., JS,
 for 2 year degree
 training.
 program; 40 month
 limit for 3 or 4
 year programs.
 Kansas..... Kan Work in 23 OJT, CWEP, JS,
 other Yes; up to BA/BS....
 Yes..... No
 counties; minimal training.
 JOBS in balance of
 State.
 Kentucky..... JOBS..... OJT, CWEP, alt.
 work Yes; limited to 6
 Yes..... No
 exp., JS.
 semesters for 2 and
 3 year programs; 8
 semesters for 4

year programs.

Louisiana..... Project Independence OJT, CWEP,
JS..... 1..... Yes; 4 year limit...

Yes..... Yes

Maine..... ASPIRE/JOBS..... OJT, JS, other
ed. & Yes; limited to 6

Yes..... Yes

training.

semesters for AA

degree, 12

semesters for BA

degree.

Maryland..... Project Independence OJT, alt. work
exp., Yes.....

Yes..... No

JS, work

supp.,

other ed. &
training.

Massachusetts..... Mass JOBS..... OJT, work
supp., JS. Yes; limited to 3

Yes..... No

years for 2-year

degree, voc-tech

programs; 6 years

for 4-year programs.

Michigan..... MOST..... OJT, work supp,
1..... No.....

Yes..... No

CWEP, JS.

Minnesota..... Project STRIDE..... OJT, work supp,
CWEP Yes.....

Yes..... No

alt. work

exp., JS.

Mississippi..... JOBS..... OJT, alt. work

exp., Yes; 4 year limit, 3

Yes..... No

JS, other

training.

year vocational.

Missouri..... FUTURES..... OJT, CWEP, JS,

other Yes.....

Yes..... No

ed. &

training.

Montana..... JOBS..... OJT, work

supp., JS, Yes.....

Yes..... Yes

CWEP, alt.

work exp.

Nebraska..... JOBS..... OJT, CWEP, alt.

work 1..... Yes.....

Yes..... No

exp., JS.

Nevada..... JOBS..... OJT, CWEP,

JS..... No.....

Yes..... No

New Hampshire..... JOBS..... OJT, CWEP,

JS..... Yes.....

Yes..... No

New Jersey..... REACH..... OJT, work supp,

2..... Yes.....

Yes..... No

CWEP, JS,

other ed.

& training.

New Mexico..... Project Forward..... OJT, CWEP, alt.

work Yes.....

Yes..... No

exp., JS,

other ed.

& training.

New York..... JOBS..... OJT, work

supp., Yes, 2 year limit...

Yes..... No

			CWEP, JS,
other ed.			
			& training.
North Carolina.....	JOBS.....		OJT, CWEP,
JS.....	Yes.....	
Yes.....	No		
North Dakota.....	JOBS.....		OJT, CWEP,
JS.....	Yes.....	
Yes.....	No		
Ohio.....	JOBS.....		OJT, work
supp.,	Yes; 2 year limit...	
Yes.....	No		
			CWEP, alt.
work			
			exp., JS.
Oklahoma.....	Education, Training		OJT, work
supp.,	1.....	Yes; 5 year limit...	
No.....	No		
	and Employment.		alt. work
exp., JS,			
			other ed. &
			training.
Oregon.....	JOBS.....		OJT, work
supp.,	1.....	No.....	
Yes.....	No		
			CWEP, alt.
work			
			exp., JS,
other			
			training.
Pennsylvania.....	New Directions.....		OJT, CWEP, alt.
work	Yes.....	
Yes.....	No		
			exp., JS,
other ed.			
			& training.
Puerto Rico.....	PASOS.....		OJT, alt. work
exp.,	Yes.....	
Yes.....	No		
			work supp.,
JS,			

		other ed. & training.
Rhode Island.....	Pathways to	Work supp.,
OJT, JS.	Yes; 24 month limit.	
Yes.....	No	
	Independence.	
South Carolina.....	Work Support Program	OJT, alt. work
exp.,	Yes; 4 year limit...	
Yes.....	No	
		JS, other ed.
&		
		training.
South Dakota.....	FIND.....	OJT CWEP,
JS.....	1.....	Yes.....
Yes.....	No	
Tennessee.....	JOBS/WORK.....	OJT, alt. work
exp.,	Yes; 4 year limit...	
Yes.....	No	
		JS.
Texas.....	JOBS.....	OJT, alt. work
exp.,	Yes; 2 year limit...	
Yes.....	No	
		JS.
Utah.....	JOBS.....	OJT, alt. work
exp.	Yes; with limits....	
Yes.....	Yes	
		(WEAT), JS.
Vermont.....	Reach Up.....	OJT, work
supp.,	Yes; 3 year limit	
Yes.....	No	
		CWEP, JS.
for AA certificate,		
5 years for BA		
degree.		
Virgin Islands.....	JOBS/HOPE.....	OJT, CWEP, work
2.....	Yes; with limits....	
Yes.....	Yes	
		supp., JS.
Virginia.....	JOBS.....	OJT, work

supp.,	Yes.....
Yes.....	No	
		alt. work
exp., JS,		
		other ed. & training.
Washington.....	JOBS/FIP.....	OJT, alt. work
exp.,	Yes; with limits....
Yes.....	No	
		CWEP, work
supp.,		
		JS.
West Virginia.....	JOBS.....	CWEP, OJT,
JS.....	Yes; 2 year limit...
Yes.....	No	
Wisconsin.....	JOBS.....	CWEP, OJT, work
2.....	Yes; 2 year limit...	
Yes.....	Yes	
		supp., JS,
alt.		
		work exp.,
other		
		training.
Wyoming.....	Wyoming	OJT, alt. work
exp.,	Yes; 4 year limit
Yes.....	Yes	
	Opportunities for	JS.
for AA &		
	Work (WOW) Program.	
vocational; 6 year		
limit for BA.		

\1\Information based on State JOBS Plan, filed for the
biennium beginning October 1, 1992.
\2\All States include a Job Search component.
\3\Unless otherwise noted, State follows basic statutory
approach and exempts the parent of a child under age 3.

Note.--Optional components can include Job Search, Alternative Work Experience, On the Job Training (OJT), Community Work Experience Program (CWEP), Work Supplementation, Other Education, and other activities.

Source: ACF/OFA/Division of JOBS Program of Department of Health and Human Services.

TABLE 10-5.--FEDERAL ALLOCATIONS AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE JOBS PROGRAM [By fiscal year; in millions of dollars]

Indians Awarded Total obligated
Title IV-A--

Jobs--total set- to
----- Total child care
 States
authorization aside States
expended -----

1993\1\ 1991\5\ ----- ----- -----	1993\2\ 1993\4\ ----- ----- -----	1993\3\ 1993 ----- ----- -----	1993\5\ 1992 ----- ----- -----	1992\5\ ----- ----- -----	
Alabama.....	9.4 	8.8	9.3	6.2	4.3
	9.0 9.9 5.4				
Alaska.....	2.8 0.9 1.8	1.8	1.7	1.4	
	1.8 1.6 1.4				
American Samoa.....	0.1
			

Arizona.....					
11.7	1.2	5.7	5.8	4.0	3.0
5.6	8.6	6.1			
Arkansas.....					
5.0		5.0	5.0	5.3	5.5
4.3	1.8	1.6			
California.....					
157.2	0.4	96.8	96.8	94.0	108.3
85.2	19.4	18.0			
Colorado.....					
10.5	(\6\)	6.7	6.7	5.9	5.3
6.7	5.3	4.0			
Connecticut.....					
12.1		6.1	6.1	7.4	9.2
6.1	7.4	6.4			
Delaware.....					
2.1		2.0	2.1	1.7	1.4
1.6	2.7	2.0			
District of Columbia.....					
4.7		4.7	4.7	3.6	3.2
4.7	3.1	3.1			
Florida.....					
38.5		15.9	15.9	14.4	13.4
15.4	19.9	16.6			
Georgia.....					
25.9		15.8	10.3	10.3	8.0
10.3	25.2	16.8			
Guam.....					
0.4		0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
0.2					
Hawaii.....					
4.1		4.1	4.1	5.0	1.7
4.1	0.2	0.2			
Idaho.....					
2.4	(\6\)	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
2.3	1.1	1.0			
Illinois.....					
49.1		25.9	25.9	20.5	19.2
20.8	12.3	7.2			
Indiana.....					
14.8		8.1	8.1	5.7	3.9

8.1	6.3	3.4			
Iowa.....					
8.4	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.5
5.9	2.5	1.8			
Kansas.....					
6.5	(\6\)	6.4	6.4	5.7	4.5
6.4	6.9	5.2			
Kentucky.....					
17.6	14.8	13.7	11.5	8.3
13.2	11.0	8.7			
Louisiana.....					
16.5	16.5	16.5	15.4	7.9
16.5	9.0	6.6			
Maine.....					
5.8	(\6\)	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.6
3.7	0.9	0.7			
Maryland.....					
16.7	14.1	14.1	16.8	14.1
11.4	15.0	10.9			
Massachusetts.....					
24.4	20.5	20.5	20.6	21.5
19.5	27.0	22.1			
Michigan.....					
55.4	0.1	35.2	35.2	28.7	21.1
35.2	22.1	15.5			
Minnesota.....					
15.8	0.9	11.7	11.7	11.5	9.5
11.5	13.9	11.3			
Mississippi.....					
10.8	(\6\)	10.8	10.8	9.4	1.5
3.2	3.4	2.4			
Missouri.....					
18.9	9.8	9.8	6.3	3.1
9.8	13.3	7.8			
Montana.....					
2.9	0.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	1.8
2.5	1.8	2.1			
Nebraska.....					
3.5	(\6\)	2.7	2.7	3.1	2.2
2.7	8.1	6.5			
Nevada.....					

2.3	(\6\)	1.2	1.2	1.0	0.7
1.2	1.0	0.8			
New Hampshire.....					
2.3	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.6
2.9	2.4	2.2			
New Jersey.....					
27.0	27.0	21.0	24.9	25.7
21.0	9.0	8.0			
New Mexico.....					
6.7	0.7	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.2
1.6	3.9	2.1			
New York.....					
85.3	(\6\)	85.2	85.2	85.8	52.4
58.6	56.1	46.7			
North Carolina.....					
22.4	(\6\)	17.7	17.7	14.9	8.0
17.7	38.0	23.6			
North Dakota.....					
1.7	0.4	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.2
0.9	1.7	1.9			
Ohio.....					
58.7	44.6	58.6	49.0	44.2
50.8	36.1	19.3			
Oklahoma.....					
9.3	0.1	6.9	6.7	6.3	5.6
6.7	16.5	13.7			
Oregon.....					
11.4	(\6\)	11.4	11.4	11.2	10.3
11.4	8.9	7.8			
Pennsylvania.....					
44.9	34.5	34.7	31.2	29.1
22.7	25.0	15.8			
Puerto Rico.....					
13.1	9.5	9.6	7.1	1.7
9.4				
Rhode Island.....					
4.8	4.2	4.8	4.2	3.6
4.4	3.6	3.2			
South Carolina.....					
8.8	5.0	5.4	4.6	3.8
4.7	3.9	2.2			

South Dakota.....						
1.7	0.5	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.0	
0.9	1.2	1.1				
Tennessee.....						
18.4		5.0	7.8	7.2	2.6	
5.6	20.0	13.2				
Texas.....						
48.2		37.2	37.2	33.6	23.2	
33.9	33.5	31.2				
Utah.....						
4.5	(\6\)	4.5	4.5	4.0	3.7	
4.1	8.8	7.7				
Vermont.....						
3.2		2.9	2.9	2.6	2.0	
2.9	2.0	1.7				
Virgin Islands.....						
0.3		0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	
0.3						
Virginia.....						
13.6		9.1	9.1	7.2	6.0	
9.1	10.5	8.4				
Washington.....						
24.4	0.5	19.9	23.9	20.1	12.0	
16.7	23.2	17.0				
West Virginia.....						
10.7		9.8	9.8	8.6	4.8	
9.8	4.7	3.2				
Wisconsin.....						
20.7	0.3	20.4	20.4	21.6	23.4	
20.4	10.7	10.2				
Wyoming.....						
1.6	(\6\)	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.0	
1.2	2.1	2.1				

Totals.....						
1,000.0	7.1	728.5	738.8	681.4	564.0	
646.6	582.5	437.9				

\1\JOBS--total authorization: Total federal funds available for the JOBS program for fiscal year 1993. \2\Indian set-aside: Ratio of adult recipients in a tribal service area to the State's total of adult recipients multiplied by the State's total allocation. \3\Excludes the Indian set-aside.

\4\Total expended: The amount of funds that left the State's treasury through September 30, 1993, for the program. \5\Total obligated: The amount of funds obligated by the State by September 30, 1993. For example, if a contract is signed by the State to provide services based on a set fee, the amount owed for those services is an obligation. That obligation becomes an expenditure only when the invoice for the services is actually paid.

\6\Denotes allocations and expenditures of less than \$50,000.

Note.--Data are up to date as of February 23, 1994. Table is based on best available data reported by States.

Source: Administration for Children and Families.

Table 10-6 shows the average monthly percent of JOBS participants in various components by State in fiscal year 1991. The numbers reveal a great deal of variation in the emphasis States place on different JOBS program components.

Table 10-7 examines the average monthly expenditures in various components of the JOBS program by State. This table shows a considerable degree of variation among States in the amount of money spent on individual JOBS components.

TABLE 10-6.--
AVERAGE MONTHLY PERCENTAGE OF JOBS PARTICIPANTS BY STATE
AND COMPONENT--FISCAL YEAR 1992

Self

Total Job	Job Job	High Job	Assigned Assess	init. Job	Vocational Work
participants	entry	school	higher	higher	training
skills	readiness	develop	emp.	search	OJT
CWEP	Other				supp.

ed. plan	ed.	training
-------------	-----	----------

Alabama.....						
5,472	7.1	29.0	1.6	10.4	5.4	
5.9	2.3	0.2	27.4	9.7	0.3	0.0
0.0	0.9					
Alaska.....						
596	1.8	18.6	11.7	7.9	0.0	3.2
39.6	0.0	9.2	6.9	0.7	0.0	0.0
0.3						
Arizona.....						
2,336	9.1	19.1	3.7	4.6	7.1	
8.6	0.6	1.3	11.6	30.7	0.7	0.0
2.8	0.0					
Arkansas.....						
3,660	0.0	22.2	8.8	0.0	10.9	
7.8	6.4	0.0	10.8	4.8	0.5	0.0
0.0	27.9					
California.....						
60,567	6.5	43.3	1.3	7.3	6.4	
11.3	5.1	0.9	14.5	2.7	1.1	0.0
3.2	0.0					
Colorado.....						
5,183	6.8	18.4	16.1	5.9	2.0	
8.4	3.6	0.0	16.0	8.8	0.4	0.8
12.8	0.0					
Connecticut.....						

5,714	7.0	36.1	8.7	11.1	9.7	
5.2	5.3	1.8	6.0	5.4	1.8	0.0
0.0	0.1					
Delaware.....						
722	3.2	7.5	0.8	11.8	3.6	2.2
0.0	0.3	51.4	5.5	0.1	0.0	0.0
13.6						
District of Col.....						
2,424	1.2	11.9	0.0	0.0	8.6	
10.2	1.0	15.4	36.1	4.5	0.1	0.0
1.9	8.8					
Florida.....						
13,750	14.4	20.9	7.0	0.6	2.0	
0.3	1.3	0.0	14.7	37.1	0.2	0.0
0.4	1.0					
Georgia.....						
9,077	6.5	29.0	20.7	8.4	2.0	
3.0	6.0	0.1	12.8	9.0	0.4	0.0
2.0	0.3					
Guam						
\1\.....						
.....						
..						
...						
Hawaii.....						
252	2.0	32.9	27.0	1.6	0.0	4.4
18.3	0.4	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6
1.2						
Idaho.....						
726	9.1	16.3	3.2	9.9	12.5	11.6
10.3	0.4	14.9	4.8	0.4	0.0	0.0
6.6						
Illinois.....						
19,180	2.8	25.5	16.2	1.7	1.6	
9.7	7.4	0.0	5.7	20.3	0.0	0.0
1.5	7.6					
Indiana.....						
4,428	7.0	31.9	10.3	8.3	14.4	
2.9	8.3	1.2	9.9	3.1	0.1	0.0
2.7	0.0					
Iowa.....						

5,667	1.6	15.0	10.9	3.6	1.4	
9.1	6.2	0.0	40.3	8.4	0.1	0.0
0.2	3.2					
Kansas.....						
3,520	8.9	29.5	14.2	13.0	6.5	
3.3	2.2	1.1	8.3	4.4	0.4	0.1
4.3	2.9					
Kentucky.....						
2,761	0.0	26.7	8.1	37.2	5.7	
8.0	3.8	0.0	3.9	3.5	0.3	0.0
0.7	0.0					
Louisiana.....						
5,624	3.6	41.9	2.2	2.3	8.7	
17.8	4.1	0.0	13.6	5.1	0.5	0.0
0.4	0.0					
Maine.....						
2,261	3.8	18.1	22.9	0.1	0.2	
1.5	12.4	0.5	32.2	6.9	0.0	0.0
0.0	1.5					
Maryland.....						
6,219	6.6	16.1	3.4	1.7	1.4	
11.1	15.5	17.4	17.2	4.7	0.3	0.0
0.0	4.5					
Massachusetts.....						
16,910	25.9	14.7	10.3	0.0	0.0	
17.2	3.4	0.6	7.4	20.4	0.0	0.1
0.0	0.0					
Michigan.....						
41,941	7.1	20.5	0.1	24.2	15.4	
3.3	3.1	2.4	15.3	4.6	0.2	0.0
3.9	0.0					
Minnesota.....						
9,785	6.6	16.1	14.9	0.0	0.0	
29.5	3.1	6.8	4.6	17.9	0.5	0.0
0.0	0.0					
Mississippi.....						
1,852	5.2	39.1	5.5	5.4	1.9	
11.1	4.6	0.9	12.1	8.0	1.0	0.3
3.7	1.2					
Missouri.....						
3,914	3.6	19.6	7.0	12.1	10.0	

11.7	3.0	0.0	17.0	11.9	0.3	0.0
0.1	3.6					
Montana.....						
2,124	24.1	9.1	6.6	2.7	1.4	
4.4	6.7	1.6	10.5	17.9	1.3	0.0
8.1	3.6					
Nebraska						
\1\.....						
.....						
.....						
.....						
Nevada.....						
921	6.4	23.1	0.0	2.7	11.3	5.4
1.1	0.0	21.6	9.1	0.1	0.0	19.1
0.0						
New Hampshire.....						
1,414	0.8	22.2	40.8	1.4	0.0	
3.7	2.8	0.0	0.8	20.4	0.1	0.0
0.0	7.0					
New Jersey.....						
13,609	5.6	29.0	6.6	0.2	0.0	
18.0	6.3	0.0	24.2	7.7	0.1	0.2
1.9	0.3					
New Mexico.....						
4,970	6.9	22.9	17.3	1.8	2.9	
14.1	0.0	0.0	16.9	12.5	0.1	0.0
4.2	0.5					
New York.....						
32,796	2.6	22.3	5.7	7.6	35.2	
5.0	4.5	4.5	2.4	0.3	0.3	0.7
4.4	0.0					
North Carolina.....						
6,895	5.3	25.3	17.9	7.4	2.0	
7.0	12.0	0.0	18.0	1.6	0.2	0.0
3.3	0.0					
North Dakota.....						
2,494	17.2	8.1	23.3	2.4	0.6	
12.9	20.6	0.0	9.5	3.3	0.5	0.0
2.3	0.0					
Ohio.....						
46,620	2.8	28.0	16,5	1.2	0.2	

3.8	1.9	1.2	21.4	7.2	0.0	0.1
15.6	0.0					
Oklahoma.....						
9,478	8.1	18.8	4.4	34.4	6.1	
8.9	1.9	0.1	3.2	4.3	0.0	0.0
8.6	1.2					
Oregon.....						
7,408	11.9	17.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	
9.2	9.5	0.0	17.3	25.6	0.0	0.0
0.0	3.8					
Pennsylvania.....						
21,435	3.7	17.3	4.6	2.2	0.0	
44.6	10.4	0.0	9.8	4.2	0.1	0.0
2.7	0.4					
Puerto Rico.....						
3,532	5.3	6.7	9.4	7.0	13.3	
13.3	2.2	1.6	36.8	1.5	0.7	0.1
0.0	2.5					
Rhode Island.....						
2,978	2.7	20.1	22.6	29.3	1.7	
16.9	1.2	0.3	3.0	1.5	0.0	0.2
0.0	0.5					
South Carolina.....						
8,533	6.7	28.8	4.9	1.3	0.8	
6.8	1.8	0.0	10.8	34.9	0.3	0.0
0.0	3.2					
South Dakota.....						
880	18.0	8.3	13.0	24.0	10.0	0.9
0.8	0.0	3.0	12.4	1.0	0.0	8.7
0.0						
Tennessee.....						
4,810	4.8	36.3	19.3	6.5	0.5	
9.1	5.4	0.0	13.8	2.1	0.8	0.0
0.2	1.1					
Texas.....						
20,641	7.5	18.6	2.8	3.1	4.5	
3.3	3.2	0.0	46.7	9.9	0.4	0.0
0.0	0.0					
Utah.....						
6,394	32.3	12.0	11.8	2.4	2.1	
10.4	3.6	0.0	14.7	7.0	0.0	0.0

3.0	0.0						
Vermont.....							
2,012	0.0	11.6	24.7	0.8	0.0		
4.7	4.0	0.0	7.7	38.6	0.3	0.0	
7.6	0.0						
Virgin Islands.....							
547	3.7	29.3	0.0	0.7	0.7	1.1	
0.0	1.8	13.7	40.8	0.0	0.0	5.5	
2.7							
Virginia.....							
8,118	6.0	23.7	14.8	4.2	2.3		
7.7	3.4	8.0	9.5	10.5	0.2	0.18	
0.0	9.3						
Washington.....							
17,054	6.1	17.5	15.2	7.0	2.6		
7.6	1.4	0.1	29.4	10.9	0.4	0.3	
0.3	1.1						
West Virginia.....							
6,763	7.3	6.4	2.6	2.9	0.5		
0.0	0.9	0.1	69.2	2.1	0.3	0.0	
4.5	3.1						
Wisconsin.....							
18,578	15.1	15.9	7.9	16.5	0.0		
3.2	4.2	0.0	10.2	14.8	0.5	1.0	
3.3	7.2						
Wyoming.....							
422	5.7	5.0	7.3	12.3	0.2	3.8	
4.7	0.0	11.4	18.2	0.9	0.0	0.0	
30.3							

U.S. total.....							
483,417	7.2	24.5	8.2	6.7	6.3		
9.5	4.5	1.4	16.5	9.4	0.4	0.1	
3.7	1.5						

\1\Data not reported.

TABLE 10-7.--
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF JOBS IV-F COMPONENT/ACTIVITY
EXPENDITURES (STATE AND FEDERAL)\1\

[Fiscal year 1992; in percent]

Assess./

Job	Self- Education Work	Self- CWEF component	State Job Other	Total Job dvpmnt/	Post initiated	Job
-----	----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	-----

employ. OJT initiated	plan supp. expenditures	skills placemnt	readiness education	secondary training	search training
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

Alabama.....

38	27	10	5	3	7
----	----	----	---	---	---

(\4\)	0	0	4	1	3
-------	---	---	---	---	---

2	\$7,427,743
---	-------------

Alaska.....

26	14	6	8	6	6
----	----	---	---	---	---

1	0	0	17	2	2	1
---	---	---	----	---	---	---

1,443,703

Arizona.....

17	69	9	0	0	5
----	----	---	---	---	---

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

1,726,660

Arkansas.....

38	20	2	8	3	5
----	----	---	---	---	---

0	0	0	14	0	6	4
6,063,886						
California.....						
27	30	13	7	0	3	
1	0	4	0	5	0	0
114,205,782						
Colorado.....						
0	3	0	0	62	0	23
0	11	0	0	0	0	
1,100,054						
Connecticut.....						
(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	
(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	
(\2\)	(\2\)					
Delaware.....						
37	16	12	1	11	6	
(\4\)	0	1	0	0	16	
0	1,978,916					
District of Columbia.....						
21	12	11	1	0	11	
(\4\)	0	1	24	14	1	
5	3,798,960					
Florida.....						
30	22	6	7	1	17	
1	(\4\)	(\4\)	5	10	1	(\4\)
20,877,410						
Georgia.....						
2	36	4	5	47	3	(\4\)
0	2	0	1	0	0	
4,497,555						
Hawaii.....						
16	24	4	11	42	(\4\)	
1	0	2	0	0	0	0
142,879						
Idaho.....						
36	18	1	21	0	10	
0	0	0	11	3	1	0
3,015,168						
Illinois.....						
14	38	10	4	16	10	
(\4\)	0	2	3	0	2	

[illegible]

[illegible]

40	6	12	11	10	5	
6	0	(\4\)	0	0	(\4\)	0
986,193						
Ohio.....						
27	14	4	4	8	11	
(\4\)	(\4\)	8	6	5	2	
0 68,673,814						
Oklahoma.....						
16	26	10	5	2	11	
(\4\)	1	0	14	13	(\4\)	
1 3,348,017						
Oregon.....						
8	25	8	27	0	26	1
0	0	4	0	0	(\4\)	
10,819,307						
Pennsylvania.....						
6	22	40	10	6	6	1
0	3	1	6	0	0	
39,922,098						
Rhode Island.....						
7	26	15	4	28	5	(\4\)
12	0	0	2	1	(\4\)	
5,226,935						
South Carolina.....						
25	26	3	10	4	11	
0	0	0	13	8	1	(\4\)
5,016,687						
South Dakota.....						
69	2	2	1	8	11	
2	0	4	0	0	2	0
794,221						
Tennessee.....						
15	45	9	7	16	2	
1	1	(\4\)	0	0	1	5
5,644,179						
Texas.....						
27	30	3	11	4	9	
(\4\)	0	0	0	5	5	
6 41,745,481						
Utah.....						
25	14	12	8	8	24	

(\4\)	0	0	6	3	0		
0	3,129,151						
Vermont.....							
0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
87,681							
Virginia.....							
21	30	12	6	10	10		
(\4\)	1	0	9	0	1		
0	9,648,182						
Washington.....							
37	16	9	3	12	8		
1	1	(\4\)	3	3	4	2	
18,750,258							
West Virginia.....							
20	29	1	26	0	14		
4	0	5	0	0	1	0	
9,975,705							
Wisconsin.....							
34	14	5	10	9	16		
2	2	6	(\4\)	2	1	(\4\)	
25,805,311							
Wyoming.....							
2	12	8	2	18	16	(\4\)	
0	0	21	0	18	2		
2,212,815							
Guam.....							
87	2	(\4\)	6	3	(\4\)		
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
265,161							
Puerto Rico.....							
(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)		
(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)	(\2\)		
(\2\)	(\2\)						
Virgin Islands.....							
59	15	26	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
187,472							

United States.....						
25	25	12	10	6	8	
1	(\4\)	3	3	4	2	1
673,097,814						

\1\These expenditures include: (1) actual IV-F administrative expenditures associated with program components/activities and supportive services (excluding child care) and (2) actual program costs (excluding supportive services program costs).
 \2\State did not report data for any quarter. \3\State did not report any data for the fourth quarter. \4\Less than .5 percent.

Source: DHHS/Administration for Children and Families/Office of Family Assistance.

Table 10-8 examines State level of effort with respect to participation in the JOBS program. The first four columns present data that the States reported to DHHS. Column 5 shows the percentage of the AFDC caseload that is not exempt from JOBS participation requirements. As with many of the previous tables there is a lot of variation among States. In Mississippi only 20 percent of AFDC families were subject to JOBS participation requirements (7 percent in Hawaii and 20 percent in Tennessee), whereas in Montana 90 percent of AFDC families were required to participate in the JOBS program. Column 6 displays countable JOBS participants (i.e., those who met the 20-hour rule requirement) as a percentage of persons required

to participate in the JOBS program. Although column 6 closely approximates the JOBS participation rate for each State, Federal law specifies the exact methodology States must use to derive their participation rates. This methodology is more complex than simply dividing the number of countable JOBS participants by the number of non-exempt AFDC adult recipients (which is how column 6 was calculated). The reader should use the data presented in table 10-8 with caution. These data have not been reviewed for accuracy and appear to overstate participation in the JOBS program, given that States have testified that they may have trouble meeting the 15 percent participation rate in fiscal year 1994 and the 20 percent rate in fiscal year 1995.

According to a May 1993 report by the General Accounting Office (GAO), ``JOBS participation rates data are not accurate nor comparably derived across States.'' The GAO report asserts that DHHS officials have been aware of the participation rate data problems in the four States surveyed by GAO and in at least 20 other States as well. The report says that DHHS officials responded that inadequate resources have prevented them from validating the processes States use to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the State's data.

JOBS: A Status Report

Federal law requires that States enroll at least 11 percent of non-exempt AFDC families in their JOBS program during fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1993 (up from 7 percent in fiscal

year 1991). In addition, effective October 1, 1992, States were required to implement the JOBS program statewide. Approximately 16 percent of adult non-exempt AFDC recipients were counted as participants of the JOBS program during fiscal year 1992 (see table 10-8). As of May 1993, information from DHHS indicates that all jurisdictions have implemented the JOBS program statewide.

To meet these new requirements, most States had to expand their JOBS program for fiscal year 1993. Some 34 States increased funding for their JOBS program; 6 States reduced funding (Arkansas, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, and Wyoming); and 4 States froze funding (Delaware, Guam, Idaho, and Minnesota). To ``draw down'' the \$1 billion available in Federal funding for the JOBS program, States must provide matching funds. Due to tight State budgets, only about 70 percent of the eligible Federal funds were claimed by States in fiscal year 1993. Only 16 States claimed their full allocation of Federal JOBS funds.

TABLE 10-8.--JOBS PARTICIPATION: STATE LEVEL OF EFFORT, FISCAL YEAR 1992
[Data based on monthly averages from October 1991-September 1992]

recipients	Total JOBS participants	Total adult
Countable JOBS		

-----	Percent of AFDC	participants, as

State	adults mandatory	a percent of	AFDC	
JOB Mandatories	Active		Countable	(1)
for JOBS	mandatories			
(2)	(3)	(4)		
(5)	(6)			

Alabama\1\.....			41,219	
10,721	5,472	3,188		
26	30			
Alaska.....			11,676	
2,577	596	452		
22	18			
Arizona\1\.....			54,593	
13,524	2,336	1,491		
25	11			
Arkansas.....			21,690	
7,933	3,680	1,928		
37	24			
California\2\.....			704,723	
276,199	60,687	33,991		
39	12			
Colorado\1\.....			40,875	
28,531	5,193	4,765		
70	17			
Connecticut.....			51,902	
31,729	5,714	7,512		
61	24			
Delaware.....			8,525	
3,496	722	638		
41	18			
District of Columbia.....			17,827	
9,032	2,424	1,054		
51	12			
Florida\1\.....			184,262	
48,315	13,750	7,488		

26	15		
Georgia\1\.....			119,752
46,438	9,077	5,751	
39	12		
Guam.....			1,325
375	NR	13	
28	3		
Hawaii\1\.....			16,738
1,124	252	113	
7	10		
Idaho\1\.....			6,450
1,346	726	522	
21	39		
Illinois.....			215,774
122,492	19,180	13,780	
57	11		
Indiana\1\.....			66,222
26,031	4,426	1,578	
39	6		
Iowa.....			35,559
11,374	5,687	1,309	
32	12		
Kansas.....			27,962
15,542	3,520	3,117	
56	20		
Kentucky\1\.....			82,362
19,502	2,761	3,962	
24	20		
Louisiana\1\.....			78,261
25,727	5,624	3,314	
33	13		
Maine.....			25,764
14,269	2,261	1,296	
55	9		
Maryland.....			71,996
36,285	6,219	3,670	
50	10		
Massachusetts.....			101,762
50,525	16,910	16,323	
50	32		
Michigan.....			233,293

130,704	41,941	22,009	
56	17		
Minnesota.....			66,722
19,520	9,785	3,181	
29	16		
Mississippi\1\.....			49,608
9,711	1,852	1,289	
20	13		
Missouri\1\.....			86,353
24,623	3,914	3,441	
29	14		
Montana\1\.....			11,495
10,339	2,124	1,772	
90	17		
Nebraska.....			15,564
6,338	NR	4,891	
41	77		
Nevada\1\.....			9,851
2,732	921	398	
28	15		
New Hampshire.....			10,358
4,145	1,414	1,027	
40	25		
New Jersey.....			111,740
62,316	13,609	8,890	
56	14		
New Mexico\1\.....			30,844
8,673	4,970	2,254	
28	26		
New York.....			374,431
169,721	32,798	24,549	
45	14		
North Carolina.....			103,944
39,980	6,895	5,543	
38	14		
North Dakota.....			6,404
2,369	2,494	725	
37	31		
Ohio.....			260,048
139,504	46,620	26,280	
54	19		

Oklahoma.....			42,866
30,057	8,478	9,634	
70	32		
Oregon.....			39,823
19,215	7,408	4,123	
48	21		
Pennsylvania.....			197,360
91,265	21,435	12,101	
46	13		
Puerto Rico\1\.....			62,068
18,450	3,532	3,484	
30	19		
Rhode Island.....			20,477
12,879	2,978	1,784	
63	14		
South Carolina.....			39,979
13,922	8,533	2,289	
35	16		
South Dakota.....			6,017
2,067	860	519	
34	25		
Tennessee.....			86,605
17,750	4,910	3,485	
20	20		
Texas\1\.....			229,610
104,537	20,841	12,026	
46	12		
Utah.....			17,346
14,601	6,394	5,074	
84	35		
Vermont.....			11,290
5,766	2,012	820	
51	14		
Virginia.....			59,443
21,612	8,118	3,855	
36	18		
Virgin Islands.....			966
380	547	99	
39	26		
Washington.....			97,557
34,876	17,054	10,889	

36	31		
West Virginia.....			45,256
23,327	6,763	3,017	
52	13		
Wisconsin.....			79,301
41,811	16,578	13,380	
53	32		
Wyoming.....			6,332
2,174	422	675	
34	31		

Total.....			4,400,166
1,888,450	483,417	310,754	
43	16		

\1\JOBS Program is not statewide as of June 3, 1992.

\2\State approved to use a sample to estimate the number of AFDC recipients required to

participate in JOBS for fiscal year 1992. NR--Data not reported.

Note.--These data should be used with caution. The first four columns from which the other columns are derived, represent State data that were not reviewed or audited for accuracy.

Source: Administration for Children and Families, DHHS.

TITLE IV-A EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

The Social Security Act permits States, at their option, to operate an Emergency Assistance program for needy families with children (whether or not eligible for AFDC) if the assistance is necessary to avoid the destitution of the child or to provide living arrangements in a home for the child. The statute authorizes 50 percent Federal matching for emergency

assistance furnished for a period not in excess of 30 days in any 12-month period. Regulations state that Federal matching is available for emergency assistance authorized by the State during one period of 30 consecutive days in any 12 consecutive months, including payments which are to meet needs which arose before the 30-day period or are for such needs as rent which extend beyond the 30-day period.

In fiscal year 1993, 40 jurisdictions operated an Emergency Assistance program. Table 10-9 presents the average monthly caseload and total fiscal year payments for jurisdictions participating in the program. Table 10-10 provides historical data on total payments.

As of October 1, 1990, according to State plans on file with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), most EA programs covered natural disasters (23 jurisdictions), such as floods, fires, and storms, and unspecified crisis threatening family or living arrangements (21 jurisdictions). Other qualifying causes for emergency aid specified by various States included (in order of frequency): eviction, potential eviction, or foreclosure; homelessness; utility shut-off or loss of heating energy supply or equipment; civil disorders or crimes of violence; child or spousal abuse; loss of employment or strike; health hazards/risks to health and safety; emergency medical needs; and illness, accident, or injury.

Note that AFDC regulations also allow States to include in

their State standards of need provision for meeting
``special
needs'' of AFDC applicants and recipients. The State plan
must
specify the circumstances under which payments will be made
for
special needs.

During the mid 1980s, some States began using AFDC
special
needs funds and/or emergency assistance funds to house
otherwise homeless families in hotels. Moreover, a few
States
were found to be using emergency assistance (EA) funds for
more
than the 30-day limit specified in law. Placement of a
family
in a hotel, a last resort that costs an average of more
than
\$1,000 a month, has been controversial, and several reports
have found dangerous and squalid conditions in some such
``welfare hotels.''

In response, DHHS issued a proposed rule (published in
the
Federal Register on December 14, 1987) restricting use of
AFDC-
special needs for housing expenses, and reconfirming the
30-day
limit on EA expenditures. The DHHS proposed regulation
would
have (1) established an ``unambiguous'' time limit on the
use
of EA funds and (2) prohibited States from adopting, either
as
a special or basic need, an AFDC shelter allowance that
varied
by type of residence (e.g., apartment or hotel). On
December
22, 1987, Congress passed legislation that prohibited,
until
October 1, 1988, the DHHS from taking any action on the
proposed EA and AFDC-special needs regulations. The

moratorium
on promulgation of the regulation was intended to give
Congress
an opportunity to determine whether and how the current
AFDC
statute should be amended to respond to the problems of
homeless families. The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless
Assistance
Amendments Act of 1988 extended the moratorium until
October 1,
1989, required DHHS to issue a report on recommendations
for
statutory and regulatory changes in AFDC-special needs and
the
EA program with respect to improving the responsiveness of
those programs to the emergency needs of AFDC-eligible
families, and eliminated the use of such funds to provide
families shelter in commercial or transient facilities. The
report was sent to Congress July 3, 1989, with a proposal
to
issue a final regulation which would prohibit reimbursement
under the EA program for assistance for periods beyond 30
consecutive days in a 12-month period (while continuing to
allow EA funds for past-due rent and utility costs and for
first month's rent and security deposit). The proposal also
would delete from the Department's previously proposed rule
the
provision precluding States from establishing AFDC shelter
allowances that vary by type of residence. In addition, the
report stated that the Department would develop legislative
proposals to prohibit the use of Federal AFDC and EA
matching
funds for welfare hotels. The 1989 OBRA prohibited the
Secretary from implementing any final EA or AFDC-special
need
regulations before October 1, 1990. The 1990 OBRA extended
this
prohibition until October 1, 1991.

TABLE 10-9.--EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE: TOTAL
CASELOAD AND PAYMENTS (FEDERAL AND STATE) FOR SELECTED

FISCAL YEARS 1985-93

Average monthly caseload Total fiscal year
 payments (in thousands) Monthly dollar

 ----- payment per

State

family

1985\1\
 1990 1992 1993\2\ 1985 1990
 1992 1993\2\ -----

1985 1993

Arizona.....					0
0	122	191	0	0	\$1,193
\$3,675	0	\$1,603			
Arkansas.....					48
0	NA	0	\$58	0	197
2,557	\$101	0			
California.....					734
450	0	0	41,554	\$40,956	
\3\247	0	4,718	0		
Colorado.....					0
0	852	0	0	0	2,602
24	0	0			
Delaware.....					194
202	161	112	232	417	
320	419	100	312		
District of Columbia.....					968
1,682	1,780	1,499	2,381	9,591	
2,995	21,276	205	1,183		
Florida.....					0
2,095	848	921	0	8,828	
3,633	3,884	0	351		

Georgia.....					854
1,704	1,094	1,454	7,405	5,029	
4,205	9,529	723	546		
Hawaii.....					0
0	90	25	0	0	745
371	0	1,237			
Illinois.....					1,161
1,998	1,724	1,177	2,295	3,218	
4,799	4,152	165	294		
Iowa.....					0
0	430	435	0	0	1,701
1,759	0	337			
Kansas.....					159
197	206	218	394	515	
514	637	206	244		
Maine.....					304
259	461	347	1,007	1,184	
1,158	749	276	180		
Maryland.....					1,784
2,000	2,084	2,169	2,445	5,060	
4,945	7,156	114	275		
Massachusetts.....					4,584
5,336	3,721	4,058	17,678	58,970	
37,850	45,676	321	938		
Michigan.....					4,211
5,656	1,372	1,490	10,067	20,432	
13,926	23,767	199	1,329		
Minnesota.....					1,165
1,849	1,755	1,913	5,624	10,427	
10,028	11,268	402	491		
Missouri.....					0
0	NA	0	0	0	758
2,418	0	0			
Montana.....					72
60	75	39	386	162	270
227	446	485			
Nebraska.....					181
253	186	172	646	1,641	
1,110	1,396	297	676		
Nevada.....					0
52	0	19	0	147	0

117	0	513				
New Hampshire.....					0	
46	244	329	0	386		882
1,214	0	307				
New Jersey.....					601	
3,820	6,577	8,678	2,171	50,902		
52,271	53,268	301	512			
New York.....					4,473	
12,724	14,580	14,750	37,543	126,878		
84,364	542,806	699	3,067			
North Carolina.....					0	
1,482	2,303	2,293	0	4,235		
5,449	5,464	0	199			
North Dakota.....					0	
0	0	335	0	0		0
1,335	0	332				
Ohio.....					5,037	
4,330	4,011	3,921	11,778	6,339		
7,767	8,600	195	183			
Oklahoma.....					803	
2,197	2,699	2,205	2,548	4,325		
5,832	3,591	264	136			
Oregon.....					1,312	
1,758	1,532	1,567	3,415	4,869		
4,246	4,763	217	253			
Pennsylvania.....					32	
1,512	525	702	92	4,705		
2,636	5,157	239	612			
Puerto Rico.....					1,069	
538	354	489	247	126		
250	192	33	33			
South Carolina.....					0	
0	0	0	0	0		0
545	0	0				
South Dakota.....					0	
0	0	63	0	0		0
359	0	475				
Utah.....					0	
106	120	120	0	257		
620	320	0	222			
Vermont.....					302	

395	304	298	364	1,395	
1,414	1,450	100	405		
Virgin Islands.....					0
NA	NA	0	0	4	0
0	0	0			
Virginia.....					18
15	43	43	63	57	89
42	290	81			
Washington.....					727
511	537	610	3,327	2,437	
2,731	3,087	381	422		
West Virginia.....					1,202
1,201	1,225	1,194	1,521	1,529	
1,764	1,819	105	127		
Wisconsin.....					44
889	799	818	197	2,437	
3,246	3,174	372	323		
Wyoming.....					466
196	94	217	1,129	482	
232	2,001	202	768		

U.S. total.....					32,500
55,514	52,906	54,869	156,565	377,942	
266,989	788,668	401	1,198		

\1\Expenditure data for fiscal year 1985 does not include prior quarter adjustments.

\2\Data for fiscal year 1993 are preliminary.

\3\Represents prior year claims.

NA--Data not available.

Source: Office of Financial Management, Administration for Children and Families.

TABLE 10-10.--TOTAL FEDERAL AND STATE PAYMENTS UNDER THE

EMERGENCY

ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1970-93

[In millions]

Amount

Fiscal year:

1970.....
\$14

1975.....
70

1980.....
109

1985.....
157

1986.....
175

1987.....
203

1988.....
256

1989.....
310

1990.....
378

1991.....
306

1992.....
631

1993.....
789

Source: Office of Financial Management, Administration for
Children and
Families.

SECTION 1115 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS--WAIVERS FROM AFDC LAW

Section 1115 of the Social Security Act authorizes the Secretary of the DHHS to waive specified requirements of the Social Security Act pertaining to the AFDC program in order to enable a State to carry out any experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects that the Secretary judges likely to help in promoting the objectives of the program. Since about 1990, States have sought to offset the huge expansion in the AFDC rolls by implementing proposals designed to change the behavior of AFDC recipients and/or by cutting benefits. Several States have linked AFDC receipt to desired behaviors such as regular school attendance, getting children immunized, and marriage. Some have tried to constrain AFDC costs by cutting benefits, providing smaller benefits to new State entrants, and by denying benefit increases to mothers that have additional children while on AFDC.

Since 1990, about 20 States have received waivers from one or more AFDC rules.

CHILD CARE FOR FAMILIES AT RISK OF AFDC RECEIPT

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 increased funding for the existing AFDC child care program to provide \$300 million for fiscal year 1991 and thereafter to the States

to provide child care services to low-income, non-AFDC families

that (1) need such care in order to work and (2) would otherwise be at risk of becoming eligible for AFDC.

Capped entitlement funds would be allocated on the basis of

child population. Rules relating to Federal matching rates, reimbursement, standards and fee schedules would match the same

rules as apply for child care for AFDC families, except that

all child care providers that receive funds must be licensed, regulated, or registered.

The At-Risk program is described in more detail in section

12.

AFDC BENEFIT LEVELS AND TRENDS

Each State establishes a ``need standard'' (the income the State decides is essential for basic consumption items) and a

``payment standard'' (100 percent or less of the need level).

Benefits are generally computed by subtracting countable income

from the State's payment standard.

Maximum payments

Maximum AFDC payments vary sharply from State to State, as

shown by tables 10-11 and 10-12. State payments for AFDC families of three with no countable income in January 1994 ranged from \$120 in Mississippi to \$923 in Alaska. Table 10-11 presents the gross income limit, the need standard, the maximum monthly potential AFDC and food stamp benefits for a one-parent family of three persons, as of January 1994, combined AFDC and food stamp benefits as a percent of the Census Bureau poverty threshold for a 3-person family, and AFDC benefits as a percent of the poverty threshold.

The food stamp benefits are calculated by deducting from the family's AFDC benefit (the only cash income of the family) the maximum deductions allowed under food stamps for a nonaged, nondisabled family: a total of \$338. This consists of a standard deduction of \$131, given in all households, plus a deduction of \$207 for excess shelter costs.

If the family qualified only for the standard deduction, its food stamp benefits would be cut in most States by about \$62. Table 10-11 shows combined maximum potential benefits of \$689 to a Maine AFDC family of 3, including \$271 in food stamps. The same family would receive only \$626 in combined benefits, including \$208 in food stamps, if it were credited only with the standard deduction. Food stamp program data show that most AFDC families do qualify for a deduction of some shelter costs.

As table 10-14 illustrates, during 1993, 11 jurisdictions increased AFDC payments. Forty jurisdictions had no payment

increases. Three jurisdictions decreased benefits. As a result of these changes, the median State benefit for a family of three decreased from \$367 to \$366 per month in nominal dollars.

TABLE 10-11.--GROSS INCOME LIMIT, NEED STANDARD, AND MAXIMUM MONTHLY POTENTIAL BENEFITS, AFDC AND FOOD STAMPS, ONE-PARENT FAMILY\1\ OF THREE PERSONS, JANUARY 1994

Gross income				
Combined	AFDC benefits	limit (185	100	Maximum
benefits as a	as a percent	percent of	percent	AFDC
State	State	percent of	of 1993	grant\2\
Food stamp	Combined	percent of	of	
benefit\3\	benefits	need	poverty	
		standard)	poverty	
threshold\4\	threshold\4\		need''	

Alabama.....		\$1,245	\$673	\$164
\$295	\$459	48	17	
Alaska.....		1,804	975	923
285	1,208	101	77	
Arizona.....		1,783	964	347
292	639	67	36	
Arkansas.....		1,304	705	204
295	499	52	21	
California.....		1,323	715	607
214	821	86	63	
Colorado.....		779	421	356
289	645	67	37	
Connecticut.....		1,258	680	680
192	872	91	71	
Delaware.....		625	338	338

295	633	66	35		
District of Columbia.....			1,317	712	420
270	690	72	44		
Florida.....			1,833	991	303
295	598	62	32		
Georgia.....			784	424	280
295	575	60	29		
Hawaii.....			2,109	1,140	712
422	1,134	103	65		
Idaho.....			1,833	991	317
295	612	64	33		
Illinois.....			1,647	890	\5\367
291	658	69	38		
Indiana.....			592	320	288
295	583	61	30		
Iowa.....			1,571	849	426
268	694	72	44		
Kansas.....			794	429	\5\429
284	713	74	45		
Kentucky.....			973	526	228
295	523	55	24		
Louisiana.....			1,217	658	190
295	485	51	20		
Maine.....			1,023	553	418
271	689	72	44		
Maryland.....			938	507	\5\366
295	661	69	38		
Massachusetts.....			1,071	579	579
222	801	83	60		
Michigan (Washtenaw County).....			1,086	587	\5\489
249	738	77	51		
Michigan (Wayne County)..			1,019	551	\5\459
258	717	75	48		
Minnesota.....			984	532	532
236	768	80	55		
Mississippi.....			681	368	120

295	415	43	13		
Missouri.....			1,565	846	292
295	587	61	30		
Montana.....			945	511	401
276	677	71	42		
Nebraska.....			673	364	364
287	651	68	38		
Nevada.....			1,293	699	348
292	640	67	36		
New Hampshire.....			3,049	1,648	550
231	781	81	57		
New Jersey.....			1,822	985	\5\424
276	700	73	44		
New Mexico.....			660	357	357
289	646	67	37		
New York (Suffolk County)			1,301	703	\5\703
201	904	94	73		
New York (New York City).			1,067	577	\5\577
239	816	85	60		
North Carolina.....			1,006	544	272
295	567	59	28		
North Dakota.....			757	409	409
273	682	71	43		
Ohio.....			1,626	879	\5\341
295	636	66	36		
Oklahoma.....			871	471	324
295	619	65	34		
Oregon.....			851	460	\5\460
293	753	78	48		
Pennsylvania.....			1,136	614	421
270	691	72	44		
Rhode Island.....			1,025	554	\5\554
268	822	86	58		
South Carolina.....			814	440	200
295	495	52	21		
South Dakota.....			908	491	417
271	688	72	43		
Tennessee.....			788	426	185

295	480	50	19	
Texas.....			1,062	574 184
295	479	50	19	
Utah.....			1,021	552 414
272	686	72	43	
Vermont.....			2,079	1,124 638
205	843	88	67	
Virginia.....			727	393 354
290	644	67	37	
Washington.....			2,142	1,158 \5\546
258	804	84	57	
West Virginia.....			919	497 249
295	544	57	26	
Wisconsin.....			1,197	647 517
241	758	79	54	
Wyoming.....			1,247	674 360
288	648	68	38	
Guam.....			611	330 330
436	766	80	34	
Puerto Rico.....			666	360 180
0	180	NA	19	
Virgin Islands.....			555	300 240
380	620	65	25	
Median AFDC State\6\...			938	507 366
295	661	69	38	

\1\In most States these benefit amounts apply also to 2-parent families of 3 (where the second parent is incapacitated or unemployed). Some, however, increase benefits for such families.

\2\In States with area differentials, figure shown is for area with highest benefit.

\3\Food stamp benefits are based on maximum AFDC benefits shown and assume deductions of \$338 monthly (\$131 standard household deduction plus \$207 maximum allowable deduction for excess shelter cost) in the 48

contiguous States and D.C. In the remaining four jurisdictions these maximum allowable food stamp deductions

are assumed: Alaska, \$582; Hawaii, \$480; Guam, \$513; and Virgin Islands, \$267. If only the standard deduction were assumed, food stamp benefits would drop by about \$62 monthly in most of the 48 contiguous States and D.C.

Maximum food stamp benefits from October 1993 through September 1994 are \$295 for a family of three except in these 4 jurisdictions, where they are as follows: Alaska, \$388; Hawaii, \$492; Guam, \$436; and Virgin Islands, \$380.

\4\Except for Alaska and Hawaii, this column is based on the Census Bureau's 1993 poverty threshold for a family of three persons, \$11,521, converted to a monthly rate of \$960. For Alaska, this threshold was increased by 25 percent; for Hawaii, by 15 percent.

\5\In these States part of the AFDC cash payment has been designated as energy aid and is disregarded by the State in calculating food stamp benefits. Illinois disregards \$18. Kansas disregards \$57. Maryland disregards \$43. New Jersey disregards \$25. New York disregards \$53. Ohio disregards \$14. Oregon disregards \$118. Rhode Island disregards \$127.85. Washington disregards \$86.

\6\With respect to maximum AFDC benefit among 50 States and D.C.

Note.--Puerto Rico does not have a food stamp program, instead a cash nutritional assistance payment is given to recipients.

Source: Table prepared by CRS from information provided by a telephone survey of the States.

TABLE 10-12.--MAXIMUM AFDC BENEFITS, BY FAMILY SIZE, JANUARY 1994\1\

1-					
person	2-person	3-person	4-person	5-person	6-person
State					
family	family	family	family	family	family

```

-----
Alabama.....
$111      $137      $164      $194      $225      $252
Alaska*\2\.....
514       821       923       1,025     1,127     1,229
Arizona\3\.....
204       275       347       418       489       561
Arkansas.....
81        162       204       247       286       331
California.....
299       490       607       723       824       926

Colorado\2\4\.....
214       280       356       432       512       590
Connecticut*\5\.....
430       549       680       792       893       999
Delaware*.....
201       270       338       407       475       544
District of Columbia.....
265       330       420       513       591       695
Florida\3\.....
180       241       303       364       426       487

Georgia.....
155       235       280       330       378       410
Hawaii.....
418       565       712       859       1,006     1,153
Idaho.....
205       251       317       382       448       513
Illinois\2\6\.....
212       268       367       414       485       545
Indiana\2\.....
139       229       288       346       405       463

Iowa.....
183       361       426       495       548       610
Kansas*.....
267       352       429       497       558       619
Kentucky.....
162       196       228       285       333       376
Louisiana\7\.....

```

72	138	190	234	277	316
Maine\2\.....					
198	312	418	526	632	739
Maryland.....					
162	286	366	441	511	562
Massachusetts*.....					
392	486	579	668	760	854
Michigan:					
(Washtenaw County)\8\.....					
305	401	489	593	689	822
(Wayne County)\8\.....					
276	371	459	563	659	792
Minnesota*\2\.....					
250	437	532	621	697	773
Mississippi.....					
60	96	120	144	168	192
Missouri.....					
136	234	292	342	388	431
Montana\2\3\.....					
235	318	401	484	567	650
Nebraska*.....					
222	293	364	435	506	577
Nevada\2\.....					
229	288	348	408	468	527
New Hampshire.....					
414	481	550	613	673	754
New Jersey.....					
162	322	424	488	552	616
New Mexico*.....					
209	283	357	431	504	578
New York:					
(Suffolk County)*\9\.....					
446	576	703	824	949	1,038
(New York City)*\9\.....					
352	468	577	687	800	884
North Carolina.....					
181	236	272	297	324	349
North Dakota*\2\.....					

221	333	409	501	569	628
Ohio.....					
203	279	341	421	493	549
Oklahoma\2\.....					
200	251	324	402	470	538
Oregon*\2\.....					
310	395	460	565	660	755
Pennsylvania\10\.....					
215	330	421	514	607	687
Rhode Island*\11\.....					
327	449	554	632	710	800
South Carolina.....					
118	159	200	240	281	321
South Dakota.....					
293	368	417	464	512	560
Tennessee.....					
95	142	185	226	264	305
Texas\2\.....					
75	158	184	221	246	284
Utah.....					
240	332	414	484	551	607
Vermont\12\.....					
437	536	638	717	804	860
Virginia\13\.....					
220	294	354	410	488	518
Washington.....					
349	440	546	642	740	841
West Virginia\3\.....					
145	201	249	312	360	413
Wisconsin\14\.....					
248	440	517	617	708	766
Wyoming\3\.....					
195	320	360	390	450	510
Guam*.....					
151	258	330	417	497	592
Puerto Rico\15\.....					
132	156	180	204	228	252
Virgin Islands.....					

120	180	240	300	360	420
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Median State\16\.....					
212	294	366	435	511	577

*These States pay 100 percent of the need standard.

\1\Maximum benefit paid for a family of given size with zero countable income. Family members include 1 adult caretaker.

\2\Alaska, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Texas also have a children-only schedule.

\3\Arizona, Florida, Montana, West Virginia and Wyoming have 2 payment schedules, 1 that includes shelter expenses and 1 that does not.

\4\Colorado no longer has separate payment schedules for winter months and nonwinter months.

\5\Connecticut has 3 rent regions. Data shown are from rent region A which has the highest rents.

\6\Illinois divides itself into 3 distinct areas with regard to payment schedules. Data shown are from the Cook County area, which includes Chicago.

\7\Louisiana has 2 payment schedules--1 for urban areas, from which our data were taken, and 1 for rural areas.

\8\Michigan has varied shelter maximums. Shown are benefits for Washtenaw County (Ann Arbor) and Wayne County (Detroit).

\9\New York has payment schedules for each social service district. Shown are the Suffolk County and New York City amounts. The figures include energy payments.

\10\Pennsylvania has four regions. The figures in the table are from region 1, which has the highest benefits.

\11\Rhode Island no longer has separate payment schedules for winter months and nonwinter months.

\12\Vermont has a base amount plus a shelter maximum that depends on whether the recipient is living inside or outside of Chittenden County. The largest amount paid to a recipient with no other income equals 60.6 percent of the base amount plus 60.6 percent of the shelter

allowance. The shelter maximum for families living in Chittenden County is \$400 per month, for those living outside Chittenden County the shelter maximum is \$325 monthly.

\13\Virginia has 3 payment schedules. The figures shown are from area 3 which has the highest benefits.

\14\Wisconsin has 2 regions--1 for urban areas, from which our data were taken, and one for rural areas.

\15\Puerto Rico pays 50 percent of need plus 50 percent of rent as paid. The figures assume rent at \$20 a month.

Officials estimate that \$20 is the average amount allowed for rent.

\16\Among 50 States and D.C.

Source: Prepared by Congressional Research Service on the basis of a telephone survey of the States.

Need and payment standards

To receive AFDC payments, a family must pass two income tests: first, a gross income test, and second, a counted ('`net'') income test. The gross income test is 185 percent of

the State's need standard for the relevant family size; and it

applies to both applicants and enrollees. This was increased by

Congress from 150 percent of the need standard by Public Law

98-369 in 1984. No one with gross income that exceeds 185 percent of the need standard can receive AFDC. For applicants,

the counted income test is 100 percent of the need standard,

and it determines whether the family is deemed to be in ``need'' (see tables 10-11 and 10-12).

However, to be eligible for an actual payment, the family's

counted income also must be below the State's payment standard,

which in 35 jurisdictions is below the need standard.

Further, a \$10 minimum payment rule imposed by Public Law 97-35 requires that counted income be at least \$10 below the payment standard for an actual payment to be made.

Table 10-13 shows the change in the AFDC need standard in selected years, from July 1970 to January 1994, by State. The increase in the median State from July 1970 to July 1975 (a period of 5 years) was 20 percent and from July 1975 to July 1980 it was 15 percent. From July 1980 to January 1994 (a period of 13½ years), the increase was 80 percent. Between July 1970 and January 1994, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose an estimated 275 percent, as compared to a 150 percent increase in the AFDC need standard.

Many States increased their need standards (but often not actual benefit levels) after passage of the gross income limit in 1981.

Trends

Table 10-14 presents information on how the maximum AFDC benefit for a 3-person family with no income has grown from July 1970 to January 1994 by State. In current dollars, the maximum benefit of the median State climbed 28 percent from July 1970-July 1975, 23 percent from July 1975-July 1980, and 27 percent from July 1980-January 1994 (a period of 13½ years).

In constant dollars (after adjustment for inflation), benefit levels failed to keep pace with inflation. The median decline in benefit levels adjusted for inflation from 1970

to
1994 was 47 percent.

TABLE 10-13.--AFDC NEED
STANDARD FOR A THREE-PERSON FAMILY BY STATE FOR SELECTED
YEARS

July January	January	January	January	January	January	January
1970\1\ 1991\2\	July 1992\2\	July 1993\2\	1985\2\ January	1988\2\	1989\2\	1990\2\
1975 1994\2\	1980					

Alabama.....						
\$184	\$180	\$192	\$384	\$384	\$571	\$578
\$603	\$637	\$673	\$673			
Alaska.....						
350	350	457	719	779	809	846
891	924	923	975			
Arizona.....						
212	233	233	233	621	621	621
621	928	964	964			
Arkansas.....						
149	245	234	234	695	705	705
705	705	705	705			
California.....						
351	316	480	555	633	663	694
694	694	703	715			
Colorado.....						
193	217	290	421	421	421	421
421	421	421	421			
Connecticut.....						

283	346	475	546	601	623	649
680	680	680	680			
Delaware.....						
245	245	266	287	319	333	333
338	338	338	338			
District of Columbia.....						
229	286	394	654	712	712	712
712	712	712	712			
Florida.....						
189	195	195	400	775	807	838
880	928	965	991			
Georgia.....						
177	193	193	366	366	376	414
424	424	424	424			
Hawaii.....						
226	428	468	468	515	557	964
1,012	1,067	1,109	1,140			
Idaho.....						
238	345	371	554	554	554	554
554	554	554	991			
Illinois.....						
232	261	288	657	713	740	777
811	844	867	890			
Indiana.....						
272	307	307	307	320	320	320
320	320	320	320			
Iowa.....						
247	309	360	497	497	497	497
497	849	849	849			
Kansas.....						
243	321	345	373	409	427	409
409	422	429	429			
Kentucky.....						
208	185	188	197	207	218	526
526	526	526	526			
Louisiana.....						
172	164	402	538	632	658	658
658	658	658	658			
Maine.....						

277	277	415	510	573	632	652
652	573	553	553			

Maryland.....

249	259	270	433	497	522	548
562	522	497	507			

Massachusetts.....

268	259	379	439	510	539	539
539	539	539	579			

Michigan (Washtenaw County).....

NA	NA	NA	592	576	608	611
622	587	587	587			

Michigan (Wayne County).....

219	333	425	557	540	572	575
586	551	551	551			

Minnesota.....

256	330	417	524	532	532	532
532	532	532	532			

Mississippi.....

202	241	220	286	368	368	368
368	368	368	368			

Missouri.....

285	325	312	312	312	312	312
312	312	312	846			

Montana.....

221	201	259	401	434	434	434
453	478	497	511			

Nebraska.....

281	279	310	350	350	364	364
364	364	364	364			

Nevada.....

269	279	285	285	550	550	550
550	620	620	699			

New Hampshire.....

262	308	346	378	486	496	506
516	516	1,513	1,648			

New Jersey.....

302	310	360	385	424	424	424
424	424	985	985			

New Mexico.....						
167	197	220	258	264	264	264
310	324	324	357			
New York (Suffolk County).....						
NA	NA	NA	579	665	665	703
703	703	703	703			
New York (New York City).....						
279	332	394	474	539	539	577
577	577	577	577			
North Carolina.....						
168	183	192	446	532	532	544
544	544	544	544			
North Dakota.....						
232	283	334	371	371	386	386
401	401	401	409			
Ohio.....						
207	346	346	627	685	712	739
776	817	853	879			
Oklahoma.....						
179	217	282	282	471	471	471
471	471	471	471			
Oregon.....						
229	369	282	386	412	420	432
444	460	460	460			
Pennsylvania.....						
265	296	332	614	614	614	614
614	614	614	614			
Rhode Island.....						
229	278	340	479	503	517	543
554	554	554	554			
South Carolina.....						
162	178	187	187	388	403	419
440	440	440	440			
South Dakota.....						
264	289	321	329	366	366	377
385	404	476	491			
Tennessee.....						
179	179	179	246	353	365	387
412	426	426	426			

Texas.....						
198	155	155	494	574	574	574
574	574	574	574			

Utah.....						
223	327	480	685	693	502	516
537	537	537	552			

Vermont.....						
287	402	670	852	889	930	973
1,029	1,112	1,122	1,124			

Virginia.....						
240	298	344	363	393	393	393
393	393	393	393			

Washington.....						
258	315	458	768	835	872	907
983	1,014	1,125	1,158			

West Virginia.....						
220	275	275	275	497	497	497
497	497	497	497			

Wisconsin.....						
214	383	522	628	647	647	647
647	647	647	647			

Wyoming.....						
246	240	315	360	360	360	360
674	674	674	674			

Guam.....						
NA	NA	261	265	265	265	330
330	330	330	330			

Puerto Rico.....						
108	108	102	180	180	180	180
180	160	360	360			

Virgin Islands.....						
NA	131	209	209	209	300	300
300	300	300	300			

Median State\3\.....						
232	279	321	401	503	522	539
544	544	554	579			

\1\Data on 3-person families were not published or reported before 1975. Thus, the 1970 data were derived by reducing the reported 4-person need

standard by the proportional difference between 3- and 4-person AFDC need standards as shown in the July 1975 DHEW reports.

\2\CRS survey data.

\3\Among 50 States and the District of Columbia.

NA--Not available.

Note.--Table compiled by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) on the basis of data from the Department of Health and Human Services and, where noted, from CRS itself.

These changes in maximum AFDC benefit levels are summarized in table 10-14 below. The median State's maximum AFDC benefit (guarantee) for a family of three rose in nominal terms from \$184 in fiscal year 1970 to \$366 in fiscal year 1994. In constant dollars, however, the median State's guarantee declined 47 percent.

Most AFDC families are eligible also for food stamps (until 1979 all were). As real AFDC benefits declined in the last dozen years, food stamp benefits rose to offset part of their losses. However, combined AFDC-food stamp benefits for a 3-person family without countable income on average dropped from \$900 (1993 dollars) in July 1972, when food stamps operated under uniform national rules, to \$658 (1993 dollars) in July 1993. This 27 percent drop was almost wholly due to shrinkage

in AFDC benefit levels. Food stamp maximum benefits were virtually unchanged in real terms, since they were adjusted for food price inflation in all years except 1982 and 1993.

TABLE 10-14.--AFDC MAXIMUM BENEFIT FOR A THREE-PERSON FAMILY, BY STATE FOR SELECTED YEARS

Percent

July1980 January	January January	January change,	January	July January	July1975 January
				1970\1\ 1992\2\ 1993\2\ 1994\2\ 1970-94\3\ ----- ----- -----	

Alabama.....				\$65	\$108
\$118	\$118	\$118	\$118	\$124	\$149
\$164	\$164	-33			
Alaska.....				328	350
457	719	749	846	891	924
923	923	-25			
Arizona.....				138	163
202	233	293	293	293	334
347	347	-33			
Arkansas.....				89	125
161	164	192	204	204	204
204	204	-39			
California.....				186	293
473	555	617	694	694	663
624	607	-13			
Colorado.....				193	217
290	346	346	356	356	356
356	356	-51			

Connecticut.....					283		346
475	546	590	649	680		680	
680	680	-36					
Delaware.....					160		221
266	287	310	333	338		338	
338	338	-44					
District of Columbia.....					195		243
286	327	364	409	428		409	
409	420	-43					
Florida.....					114		144
195	240	264	294	294		303	
303	303	-29					
Georgia.....					107		123
164	208	256	273	280		280	
280	280	-30					
Hawaii.....					226		428
468	468	468	602	632		666	
693	712	-16					
Idaho.....					211		300
323	304	304	315	315		315	
315	317	-60					
Illinois.....					232		261
288	341	342	367	367		367	
367	367	-58					
Indiana.....					120		200
255	256	256	288	288		288	
288	288	-36					
Iowa.....					201		294
360	360	381	410	426		426	
426	426	-43					
Kansas.....					222		321
345	373	403	409	409		422	
429	429	-48					
Kentucky.....					147		185
188	197	197	228	228		228	
228	228	-59					
Louisiana.....					88		128
152	190	190	190	190		190	
190	190	-42					

Maine.....					135		176
280	370	405	453	453		453	
453	418	-17					
Maryland.....					162		200
270	313	345	396	406		377	
359	366	-40					
Massachusetts.....					268		259
379	396	491	539	539		539	
539	579	-42					
Michigan (Wayne County).....					219		333
425	468	473	516	525		459	
459	459	-44					
Minnesota.....					256		330
417	524	532	532	532		532	
532	532	-45					
Mississippi.....					56		48
96	96	120	120	120		120	
120	120	-43					
Missouri.....					104		120
248	263	279	289	292		292	
292	292	-25					
Montana.....					202		201
259	332	354	359	370		390	
390	401	-47					
Nebraska.....					171		210
310	350	350	364	364		364	
364	364	-43					
Nevada.....					121		195
262	233	285	330	330		372	
348	348	-23					
New Hampshire.....					262		308
346	378	397	506	516		516	
516	550	-44					
New Jersey.....					302		310
360	385	404	424	424		424	
424	424	-63					
New Mexico.....					149		169
220	258	258	264	310		324	

324	357	-36				
New York City.....				279		332
394	474	497	577	577	577	
577	577	-45				
North Carolina.....				145		183
192	223	259	272	272	272	
272	272	-50				
North Dakota.....				213		283
334	371	371	386	401	401	
401	409	-49				
Ohio.....				161		204
263	290	302	334	334	334	
341	341	-44				
Oklahoma.....				152		217
282	282	310	325	341	341	
324	324	-43				
Oregon.....				184		337
282	386	397	432	444	460	
460	460	-33				
Pennsylvania.....				265		296
332	364	382	421	421	421	
421	421	-58				
Rhode Island.....				229		278
340	479	503	543	554	554	
554	554	-35				
South Carolina.....				85		96
129	187	199	206	210	210	
200	200	-37				
South Dakota.....				264		289
321	329	366	377	385	404	
404	417	-58				
Tennessee.....				112		115
122	138	155	184	195	185	
185	185	-56				
Texas.....				148		116
116	167	184	184	184	184	
184	184	-67				
Utah.....				175		252
360	363	376	387	402	402	

402	414	-37				
Vermont.....				267		322
492	558	572	662	679	673	
659	638	-36				
Virginia.....				225		268
310	327	354	354	354	354	
354	354	-58				
Washington.....				258		315
458	476	492	501	531	531	
546	546	-44				
West Virginia.....				114		206
206	206	249	249	249	249	
249	249	-42				
Wisconsin.....				184		342
444	533	544	517	517	517	
517	517	-25				
Wyoming.....				213		235
315	360	360	360	360	360	
360	360	-55				
Guam.....				NA		NA
261	265	265	330	330	330	
330	330	NA				
Puerto Rico.....				43		43
44	90	90	90	90	180	
180	180	+12				
Virgin Islands.....				NA		131
209	171	171	240	240	240	
240	240	NA				

Median State\4\.....				184		235
288	332	354	364	367	372	
367	366	-47				

\1\Data on 3-person families were not published or reported before 1975. Thus, the 1970 data were derived by reducing

the reported 4-person maximum

benefit amount by the proportional difference between 3- and 4-person AFDC maximum benefit as shown in the July 1975 DHEW reports.

\2\CRS survey data.

\3\Real percentage change, calculated assuming a January 1994 CPI-U value of 146.2 relative to the July 1970 value of 39.0.

\4\Among 50 States and the District of Columbia.

NA--Not available.

Note.--Table compiled by CRS on the basis of data from DHHS and, where noted, from CRS itself.

TABLE 10-15.--HISTORICAL TRENDS IN AVERAGE PAYMENT PER RECIPIENT AND PER FAMILY; AND MAXIMUM AND MEDIAN BENEFITS FOR A FAMILY OF FOUR; FOR SELECTED YEARS FROM 1970 TO 1993\1\

AFDC payments					1970	1975	1980
1985	1986	1987	1989	1991	1992	1993	
Average monthly benefit per family.....							
339	352	359	381	388	383	377	274
In constant 1993 dollars\2\...					663	564	480
455	464	457	444	412	394	377	
Average monthly benefit per person.....							
116	120	123	131	135	134	133	94
In constant 1993 dollars\2\...					171	169	165
156	158	156	153	143	138	133	
Median State benefit in July for a family unit of 4 with no income\1\.....							
399	415	420	432	435	435	435	350
In constant 1993 dollars\2\...					823	709	614

536 547 534 503 462 448 435

\1\Among 50 States and the District of Columbia.

\2\The constant dollar numbers were calculated using the CPI-U.

Note.--AFDC benefit amounts have not been reduced by child support enforcement collections.

Source: Family Support Administration and the Congressional Research Service.

TABLE 10-16.--INCOME LEVELS AT WHICH AFDC ELIGIBILITY ENDS FOR A FAMILY OF 3, BY STATE AND PERIOD OF RECEIPT, JANUARY

1994\1\2\

First 4 months

After 12 months

Eligibility	185	Eligibility	
level as a	percent	Payment	AFDC
Effective	percent of--	level as a	maximum
eligibility	standard	Effective	percent of--
		eligibility	benefit

level	Poverty	Minimum	level	Poverty	Minimum
level	wage		level	wage	

Alabama.....	\$1,245	\$164	\$164
366	38	50	254
			26
			34

Alaska.....	1,804	923	923	
1,505	125	204	1,013	84 137
Arizona.....	1,783	347	347	
641	67	87	437	46 59
Arkansas.....	1,304	204	204	
426	44	58	294	31 40
California.....	1,323	607	607	
1,031	107	140	697	73 95
Colorado.....	779	421	356	
752	78	102	511	53 69
Connecticut.....	1,258	680	680	
1,140	119	155	770	80 104
Delaware.....	625	338	338	
627	65	85	428	45 58
District of Columbia.	1,317	420	420	
750	78	102	510	53 69
Florida.....	1,833	303	303	
575	60	78	393	41 53
Georgia.....	784	424	280	
756	79	103	514	54 70
Hawaii.....	2,109	712	712	
1,188	108	161	802	73 109
Idaho.....	1,833	317	317	
596	62	81	407	42 55
Illinois.....	1,647	367	367	
671	70	91	457	48 62
Indiana.....	592	288	288	
552	58	75	378	39 51
Iowa.....	1,571	426	426	
759	79	103	516	54 70
Kansas.....	794	429	429	
764	80	104	519	54 70
Kentucky.....	973	526	228	
909	95	123	616	64 84
Louisiana.....	1,217	190	190	
405	42	55	280	29 38
Maine.....	1,023	553	418	
950	99	129	643	67 87

Maryland.....	938	366	366	
669 70 91	456	48	62	
Massachusetts.....	1,071	579	579	
989 103 134	669	70	91	
Michigan (Wayne County).....	1,019	459	459	
809 84 110	549	57	74	
Minnesota.....	984	532	532	
918 96 125	622	65	84	
Mississippi.....	681	368	120	
672 70 91	458	48	62	
Missouri.....	1,565	292	292	
558 58 76	382	40	52	
Montana.....	945	401	401	
722 75 98	491	51	67	
Nebraska.....	673	364	364	
666 69 90	454	47	62	
Nevada.....	1,293	348	348	
642 67 87	438	46	59	
New Hampshire.....	3,049	550	550	
945 98 128	640	67	87	
New Jersey.....	1,822	424	424	
756 79 103	514	54	70	
New Mexico.....	660	357	357	
656 68 89	447	47	61	
New York (New York City).....	1,067	577	577	
986 103 134	667	69	91	
North Carolina.....	1,006	544	272	
936 98 127	634	66	86	
North Dakota.....	757	409	409	
734 76 100	499	52	68	
Ohio.....	1,626	341	341	
632 66 86	431	45	58	
Oklahoma.....	871	324	324	
606 63 82	414	43	56	
Oregon.....	851	460	460	

810	84	110	550	57	75
Pennsylvania.....			1,136	421	421
752	78	102	511	53	69
Rhode Island.....			1,025	554	554
951	99	129	644	67	87
South Carolina.....			814	200	200
420	44	57	290	30	72
South Dakota.....			908	417	417
746	78	101	507	53	69
Tennessee.....			788	426	185
759	79	103	516	54	70
Texas.....			1,062	184	184
396	41	54	274	29	37
Utah.....			1,021	414	414
741	77	101	504	53	68
Vermont.....			2,079	638	638
1,077	112	146	728	76	99
Virginia.....			727	354	354
651	68	88	444	46	60
Washington.....			2,142	546	546
939	98	127	636	66	86
West Virginia.....			919	249	249
494	51	67	339	35	46
Wisconsin.....			1,197	517	517
896	93	122	607	63	82
Wyoming.....			1,247	590	360
1005	105	136	680	71	92
Guam.....			611	330	330
615	64	83	420	44	57
Puerto Rico.....			296	180	180
390	41	53	270	28	37
Virgin Islands.....			555	240	240
480	50	65	330	34	45

 \1\These calculations assume no child care expenses and
 work expenses of \$90 per month. The breakevens for 5-12
 months can be obtained by adding \$30 to the breakeven for
 ``After 12 months.'' The calculations are also based

on a 1993 poverty level of \$11,521 (\$960 per month) for a family of three, and a 1993 minimum wage salary of \$8,840 (\$737 per month).

\2\Income level at which Medicaid eligibility ends. Because of minimum payment rule, actual AFDC benefits may end at a slightly different income level.

Source: Congressional Research Service.

AFDC benefits for special needs

In general, the AFDC need standard provides for basic consumption items such as food, clothing, shelter, fuel and utilities, personal care items, and household supplies that are essential to recipients. The need standard may also provide for special (recurrent or nonrecurrent) needs, such as special dietary requirements, pregnancy allowance, training and/or educational expenses, expenses caused by catastrophe or eviction, etc.

``Special needs,'' which may be recurring or nonrecurring, are usually defined as those needs that are recognized by the State as essential for some persons but not for all, and therefore must be determined on an individual basis. They are part of the total ``need standard'' used to measure AFDC eligibility and determine benefits amount for those families for whom such special needs items are appropriate. Federal funds pay at least 50 percent of each State's AFDC benefit expenditures which include funds spent on special need items, and about 54 percent of U.S. total AFDC benefit costs. (The Federal Government also pays one-half the cost of each State's AFDC administrative costs.) Note that AFDC benefit amount information included elsewhere in this section does not take

into account payments related to special needs.

The first mention of special needs in Federal regulations occurred on July 17, 1968. These were interim regulations. Final regulations, with identical AFDC-special needs language, were published and took effect on January 29, 1969. Title 45, section 233.20(a)(2)(v) of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (1987), unchanged from the 1969 regulations, requires States to specify in their AFDC State plan a statewide standard, expressed in dollars, to be used in determining need of applicants and recipients and the amount of the benefit payment. Further, if the State includes ``special need' items in its standard, it must describe them and the circumstances under which they will be taken into account. Regulations require that special needs in a State standard be considered for all AFDC applicants or recipients who require them, except that work expenses and child care/dependent care costs resulting from work, job search, or participation in a community work experience program cannot be defined as special needs.

As of October 1, 1990, according to State plans on file with the Department of Health and Human Services, 32 jurisdictions included special need items in their State standard. Examples of the special need items specified by States follow: child care that was not related to employment; training and/or educational expenses; special transportation; pregnancy allowance; special clothing and clothing replacement; expenses caused by catastrophe or eviction; excess shelter, fuel, or utilities costs; repair of property, appliances,

or

furnishings; special diets; telephone or special telephone services; fees and/or deposits; funeral and burial expenses;

temporary shelter; and moving and/or storage expenses.

Additional/excess cost of shelter, fuel, or utilities, pregnancy allowance, and child care costs (not employment related), were the most frequently cited special need items. As

inferred above, 22 jurisdictions specified no special need items. New York specified the most special needs items, 19, followed by California and Connecticut which both specified 10

items.

FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING OF AFDC BENEFIT PAYMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE

COSTS

AFDC benefit payments and administrative costs

The Federal share of a State's AFDC benefit payments is determined by the matching formula specified for Medicaid in

title XIX of the Social Security Act (States may choose an alternate formula, but none do so). The Federal Medicaid matching rate is inversely related to State per capita income;

thus, Federal matching for AFDC benefit payments varies from

State to State, ranging from 50 percent in States with high per

capita incomes to close to 80 percent in Mississippi, a State

with relatively low per capita income. Table 10-17 provides State-specific information on the Federal share of AFDC benefit payments.

For the outlying areas--Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin

Islands--75 percent Federal matching is provided for AFDC

benefits, but the law imposes a ceiling on total Federal funds for AFDC and several other programs. The ceilings are as follows: Puerto Rico, \$82 million; Guam, \$3.8 million; and the Virgin Islands, \$2.8 million.

The Federal Government pays 50 percent of the costs of administering the AFDC program in all States.

Some States require their localities to finance a portion of the non-Federal share of benefit payments (see table 10-18), and the non-Federal share of administrative costs (see table 10-19).

Table 10-20 provides information on total Federal and State benefit payments under the single parent and unemployed parent programs for fiscal years 1970 through 1993, and DHHS projections for fiscal years 1994 through 1999 (for State-level data on benefit payments, see table 10-23). Table 10-21 breaks these data down into their Federal and State shares, and also includes information on administrative costs for the AFDC program.

TABLE 10-17.--FEDERAL SHARE OF AFDC BENEFITS PAYMENTS,
 \1\ SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1984 THROUGH 1995

[In percent]

State					
1984-85\2\	1988	1990	1992	1994	1995
Alabama.....	72.14	73.29	73.21	72.93	71.22
				70.45	

Alaska.....	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Arizona.....	61.21	62.12	60.99	62.61	65.90	66.40
Arkansas.....	73.65	74.21	74.58	75.66	74.46	73.75
California.....	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Colorado.....	50.00	50.00	52.11	54.79	54.30	53.10
Connecticut.....	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Delaware.....	50.00	51.90	50.00	50.12	50.00	50.00
District of Columbia.....	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Florida.....	58.41	55.39	54.70	54.69	54.78	56.28
Georgia.....	67.43	63.84	62.09	61.78	62.47	62.23
Guam (Federal funds limited)\3\.....	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00
Hawaii.....	50.00	53.71	54.50	52.57	50.00	50.00
Idaho.....	67.28	70.47	73.32	73.24	70.92	70.14
Illinois.....	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Indiana.....	59.93	63.71	63.76	63.85	63.49	63.03
Iowa.....	55.24	62.75	62.52	65.04	63.33	62.62
Kansas.....	50.67	55.20	56.07	59.23	59.52	58.90
Kentucky.....	70.72	72.27	72.95	72.82	70.91	69.58
Louisiana.....	64.65	68.26	73.12	75.44	73.49	72.65

Maine.....	70.63	67.08	65.20	62.40	61.96	63.30
Maryland.....	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Massachusetts.....	50.13	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Michigan.....	50.70	56.48	54.54	55.41	56.37	56.84
Minnesota.....	52.67	53.98	52.74	54.43	54.65	54.27
Mississippi.....	77.63	79.65	80.18	79.99	78.85	78.58
Missouri.....	61.40	59.27	59.18	60.84	60.64	59.86
Montana.....	64.41	69.40	71.35	71.70	71.05	70.81
Nebraska.....	57.13	59.73	61.12	64.50	61.98	60.40
Nevada.....	50.00	50.25	50.00	50.00	50.31	50.00
New Hampshire.....	59.45	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
New Jersey.....	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
New Mexico.....	69.39	71.52	72.25	74.33	74.17	73.31
New York.....	50.88	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
North Carolina.....	69.54	68.68	67.46	66.52	65.14	64.71
North Dakota.....	61.32	64.87	67.52	72.75	71.13	68.73
Ohio.....	55.44	59.10	59.57	60.63	60.83	60.69
Oklahoma.....	58.47	63.33	68.29	70.74	70.39	70.05
Oregon.....						

57.12	62.11	62.95	63.55	62.12	62.36
Pennsylvania.....					
56.04	57.35	56.86	56.84	54.61	54.27
Puerto Rico (Federal funds limited)\3\.....					
75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00
Rhode Island.....					
58.17	54.85	55.15	53.29	53.87	55.49
South Carolina.....					
73.51	73.49	73.07	72.66	71.08	70.71
South Dakota.....					
68.31	70.43	70.90	72.59	69.50	68.06
Tennessee.....					
70.66	70.64	69.64	68.41	67.15	66.52
Texas.....					
54.37	56.91	61.23	64.18	64.18	63.31
Utah.....					
70.84	73.73	74.70	75.11	74.35	73.48
Vermont.....					
69.37	66.23	62.77	61.37	59.55	60.82
Virgin Islands (Federal funds limited)\3\.....					
75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00	75.00
Virginia.....					
56.53	51.34	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00
Washington.....					
50.00	53.21	53.88	54.98	54.24	51.97
West Virginia.....					
70.57	74.84	76.61	77.68	75.72	74.60
Wisconsin.....					
56.87	58.98	59.28	60.38	60.47	59.81
Wyoming.....					
50.00	57.96	65.95	69.10	65.63	62.87

\1\The Federal share of the AFDC program is calculated by the same formula used to determine the Federal share of medicaid costs except in States that elect an alternate formula or have no medicaid program. Texas chose the alternate formula until July 1, 1983. Arizona used

the alternate formula until the first quarter of fiscal year 1983, when it was deemed qualified to use the medicaid formula for the first time.
 \2\Effective Oct. 1, 1983, through Sept. 30, 1985.
 \3\Public Law 96-272 made permanent the 75-percent matching rate for AFDC effective Oct. 1, 1979. For medicaid the matching rate remains 50 percent.

Source: Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.

TABLE 10-18.--FINANCING OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE OF BENEFIT PAYMENTS,
 FOR STATES USING STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS, AS OF OCTOBER 1993

Percent	Percent
	State funds
local funds	

California\1\.....	95.0
5.0	
Colorado.....	57.3
42.7	
Indiana.....	60.0
40.0	
Minnesota\2\.....	85.0
15.0	
Montana\3\.....	77.5
22.5	
New Jersey.....	75.0
25.0	
New York\4\.....	50.0
50.0	
North Carolina\5\.....	50.0
50.0	
North Dakota\5\.....	75.0

25.0	
Ohio\6\.....	36.1
4.0	
Wisconsin\7\.....	
100.0	

-
- \1\Counties pay up to 100 percent of some types of emergency assistance costs.
- \2\Counties finance 90 percent of the non-Federal costs of the emergency assistance program.
- \3\For all cases in State-administered counties and Indian cases in State-supervised counties, State funds only.
- \4\For persons with State residence. For persons without State residence, for persons eligible for public assistance and care under AFDC and who are released from a State mental hygiene facility after a stay of 5 or more years, and for Indians living on reservations, State pays 100 percent of assistance.
- \5\State pays 100 percent for Indians living on reservations.
- \6\Percentage of total costs before deduction of Federal share.
- \7\State pays State costs and up to 100 percent of local costs.
- Localities pay foster care and institutional costs in excess of State appropriations.

Source: ``Characteristics of State Plans for AFDC,''
Administration For
Children and Families.

TABLE 10-19.--FINANCING OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE OF COSTS

OF

ADMINISTRATION, FOR STATES USING STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS,
AS OF OCTOBER

1993

	Percent State funds	Percent
local funds		
Arkansas.....	100% in 50 counties;	25
counties	lesser proportion in	
participate in	25 counties.	
maintenance costs.		
California\1\.....	100% of State costs;	30% of
local costs.	70% of local costs.	
Colorado.....	60%.....	40%
Indiana.....	100% of State costs,	50% or
more of	plus up to 50% of	
specified local	specified local	costs.
	costs.	
Iowa.....	100% of State and	100% of
local costs.	district costs.	
Maryland.....	100% of State	100% of
local and	budgeted positions.	
nonbudgeted		
positions.		
Minnesota.....	Varies with	Varies
with State	appropriations.	
appropriations.		
Mississippi.....	Varies according to	Varies
according to		

	county population.	county
population.		
Montana\2\.....	50%.....	50%.
Nebraska.....	Varies.....	Local
funds used for		some
travel, rent,		and
equipment.		
New Jersey.....	100% of State costs..	100% of
local costs.		
New York.....	50% (or 100% for Indians living on reservations).	50%.
North Carolina.....	100% of State costs	Portion
of local	and varying	costs
not covered by	proportion of local	State
appropriation.	costs, based on prior actual expenditures.	
North Dakota.....	100% of State costs..	100% of
local costs		if
able.		
Ohio.....	45.5%\3\.....	4.5%.
South Dakota.....	100% of State costs..	100% of
local costs.		
Virginia.....	60%.....	40%.
Wisconsin.....	100% of State costs	Any
costs in excess	and up to 100% of	of
State	local costs.	
appropriation.		

\1\Counties pay 100 percent of non-Federal share of costs
for emergency

assistance cases involving removal of a child from the home.

\2\State pays all administrative costs in State-administered counties.

\3\Percentage of total cost before deduction of Federal share (50.0%).

Source: State Plans for AFDC, Administration For Children and Families.

TABLE 10-20.--FEDERAL AND STATE AFDC BENEFIT PAYMENTS UNDER THE SINGLE PARENT AND UNEMPLOYED PARENT

PROGRAMS: FISCAL YEARS

1970 TO 1999

[In millions of

dollars]

Total, Column (4)

Single

Child support columns expressed

Fiscal year

parent\1\

Unemployed collections\2\ (1) and in 1993

parent (2) minus constant

(3)\3\ dollars\4\

(1)

(2) (3) (4) (5)

1970..... 3,851

231 0 4,082 14,535

1971..... 4,993

412 0 5,405 18,380

1972..... 5,972

422 0 6,394 20,996

1973..... 6,459

414	0	6,873	21,676	
1974.....				6,881
324	0	7,205	20,972	
1975.....				7,791
362	0	8,153	21,586	
1976.....				8,825
525	286	9,064	22,464	
1977.....				9,420
617	423	9,614	22,180	
1978.....				9,624
565	472	9,717	21,063	
1979.....				9,865
522	597	9,790	19,485	
1980.....				10,847
693	593	10,947	19,587	
1981.....				11,769
1,075	659	12,185	19,825	
1982.....				11,601
1,256	771	12,086	18,372	
1983.....				12,136
1,471	865	12,742	18,526	
1984.....				12,759
1,612	983	13,388	18,670	
1985.....				13,024
1,556	901	13,679	18,397	
1986.....				13,672
1,563	951	14,284	18,753	
1987.....				14,807
1,516	1,071	15,252	19,455	
1988.....				15,243
1,420	1,197	15,466	18,953	
1989.....				15,889
1,350	1,287	15,952	18,656	
1990.....				17,059
1,480	1,416	17,123	19,077	
1991.....				18,529
1,827	1,603	18,753	19,890	
1992.....				20,121
2,119	1,822	20,418	21,019	
1993.....				19,990
2,298	1,937	20,351	20,351	

1994\5\.....				20,462
2,223	2,132	20,553	19,982	
1995\5\.....				21,009
2,188	2,376	20,821	19,709	
1996\5\.....				21,763
2,168	2,619	21,312	19,642	
1997\5\.....				22,615
2,173	2,845	21,943	19,692	
1998\5\.....				23,453
2,183	3,085	22,551	19,708	
1999\5\.....				24,396
2,207	3,325	23,278	NA	

 \1\Includes payments to two-parent families where one adult is incapacitated.

\2\Total AFDC collections (including collections on behalf of foster care children) less payments to recipients.

\3\Net AFDC benefits--Gross benefits less those reimbursed by child support collections.

\4\Adjusted based on the CPI-XI index by Committee staff.

\5\Administration projection under current law.

NA--Not available.

Source: Office of Financial Management, Administration for Children and Families.

TABLE 10-21.--TOTAL, FEDERAL, AND STATE AFDC EXPENDITURES: FISCAL YEARS 1970 TO 1999

[In millions of

dollars]

		Federal share
State share	Total	

 Fiscal year

Administrative

Benefits	Benefits	Administrative
----------	----------	----------------

1970.....	2,187	\1\572
1,443	186	4,082
1971.....	3,008	271
2,469	254	5,477
1972.....	3,612	\2\240
2,942	241	6,554
1973.....	3,865	313
3,138	296	7,003
1974.....	4,071	379
3,300	362	7,371
1975.....	4,625	552
3,787	529	8,412
1976.....	5,258	541
4,418	527	9,676
1977.....	5,626	595
4,762	583	10,388
1978.....	5,701	631
4,890	617	10,591
1979.....	5,825	683
4,954	668	10,779
1980.....	6,448	750
5,508	729	11,956
1981.....	6,928	835
5,917	814	12,845
1982.....	6,922	878
5,934	878	12,857
1983.....	7,332	915
6,275	915	13,607
1984.....	7,707	876
6,664	822	14,371
1985.....	7,817	890
6,763	889	14,580
1986.....	8,239	993

6,996	967	15,235	1,960	
1987.....			8,914	1,081
7,409	1,052	16,323	2,133	
1988.....			9,125	1,194
7,538	1,159	16,663	2,353	
1989.....			9,433	1,211
7,807	1,206	17,240	2,417	
1990.....			10,149	1,358
8,390	1,303	18,539	2,661	
1991.....			11,165	1,373
9,191	1,300	20,356	2,673	
1992.....			12,252	1,422
9,988	1,342	22,240	2,764	
1993.....			12,270	1,518
10,016	1,438	22,286	2,956	
1994\3\.....			12,470	1,564
10,215	1,493	22,685	3,057	
1995\3\.....			12,756	1,597
10,441	1,558	23,197	3,155	
1996\3\.....			13,160	1,637
10,771	1,619	23,931	3,256	
1997\3\.....			13,631	1,682
11,157	1,682	24,788	3,365	
1998\3\.....			14,097	1,741
11,539	1,741	25,636	3,483	
1999\3\.....			14,629	1,802
11,974	1,802	26,603	3,605	

 \1\Includes expenditures for services.
 \2\Administrative expenditures only.
 \3\Administration projection under current law.

NA--Not available.

Note.--Benefits do not include emergency assistance payments or reimbursement from child support enforcement collections. Foster care payments are included from 1971 to 1980. Beginning in fiscal year 1984, the cost of certifying AFDC households for food stamps are shown in

the food stamp appropriation, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Administrative costs include Child Care administration, Work Program, ADP, FAMIS, Fraud Control, SAVE and other State and local administrative expenditures.

Source: Office of Financial Management, Administration for Children and Families.

AFDC CASELOAD DATA

Table 10-22 presents State-specific information on caseloads and benefit payments under the AFDC single parent and unemployed parent programs. Average monthly benefits per AFDC family were \$373 in fiscal year 1993. Table 10-23 provides similar information for the unemployed parents program only.

Table 10-24 presents data on the average monthly number of families and individuals receiving AFDC benefits since 1970.

The table includes information on families and individuals in both the single parent and unemployed parent programs. In fiscal year 1993, the average monthly family enrollment in the combined programs was almost 5.0 million, and 359 thousand of these families were in the unemployed parent program. The table also includes historical information on the average monthly benefit under the combined programs.

The number of AFDC families rose more than 50 percent from 1971 to 1981, reaching a high of 3.9 million (monthly average) in 1981. In 1982, after OBRA took effect, the number dropped 8 percent, but in 1983 it rose 2.3 percent. Enrollment in

reached an all time high and is projected to increase steadily (but at a much slower rate) over the next 5 years to 5.6 million in 1999.

Table 10-26 shows the number of total AFDC recipients and the number of child recipients for 1970 to 1993, and shows these numbers as percentages of the total population and the poverty population, respectively. As a percentage of the total

population, AFDC recipients declined by over one-half a percentage point from the mid-1970s to 1989. Between 1989 and 1991, the percentage of the population receiving AFDC increased significantly but is still below the early 1970 levels. The percentage of children receiving AFDC remained relatively constant at around 11 percent between 1972 and 1989, hitting a low of 10.75 percent in 1982. In 1990, the percentage rose to almost 12 percent and is expected to increase to a little over 13 percent in 1993. As a percentage of children in poverty, child AFDC recipients have fallen from a high of 80.5 percent in 1973 to a low of 49.6 percent in 1982, and have risen to 59.9 percent in 1990.

TABLE 10-22.--AVERAGE MONTHLY NUMBER OF AFDC FAMILIES AND RECIPIENTS, TOTAL BENEFIT PAYMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, AND AVERAGE PAYMENT PER FAMILY AND RECIPIENT, FISCAL YEAR 1993 (PRELIMINARY DATA)

Average payment	Total	Average	Average
	Total	Annual	

per	State	Family	Recipient	assistance administrative payments costs (in	monthly caseload cost per	monthly cost per
recipients	-----			(millions)	(thousands)	
AFDC		(thousands)	(thousands)	millions)\1\ \2\	family	
Alabama.....				\$95.5	52	
140 \$154		\$57		\$20.6		\$399
Alaska.....				110.6	12	
36 762		253		8.9		736
Arizona.....				268.7	70	
197 320		114		35.9		513
Arkansas.....				59.8	27	
73 187		69		12.9		485
California.....				5,855.0	859	
2,463 568		198		499.4		581
Colorado.....				164.0	43	
123 322		111		24.8		584
Connecticut.....				386.3	57	
162 562		199		27.5		480
Delaware.....				39.7	11	
28 290		119		6.4		561
District of Columbia...				112.6	25	
67 378		141		27.9		1,125
Florida.....				804.7	254	
695 264		97		125.8		495
Georgia.....				432.1	141	
398 255		90		56.7		401
Guam.....				9.2	2	
5 511		142		1.7		1,133
Hawaii.....				143.4	18	
56 653		214		9.3		508
Idaho.....				28.5	8	
21 301		112		8.3		1,051
Illinois.....				882.9	231	

689	318	107	77.1	333
Indiana.....			224.8	73
212	257	88	41.0	562
Iowa.....			163.3	37
101	371	135	17.7	482
Kansas.....			125.9	30
88	347	119	22.3	738
Kentucky.....			210.0	83
225	211	78	39.0	471
Louisiana.....			176.9	90
263	164	56	20.5	228
Maine.....			117.1	24
67	408	145	6.4	268
Maryland.....			316.5	80
221	329	119	71.8	895
Massachusetts.....			749.9	114
325	546	192	70.5	616
Michigan.....			1,190.1	230
688	432	144	168.6	734
Minnesota.....			384.0	64
192	499	167	57.5	897
Mississippi.....			86.9	60
172	120	42	13.3	221
Missouri.....			283.8	90
262	263	90	34.0	378
Montana.....			49.1	12
35	350	118	9.1	778
Nebraska.....			65.6	17
48	327	113	12.0	719
Nevada.....			44.0	13
35	282	104	10.3	792
New Hampshire.....			56.0	11
30	424	158	6.7	609
New Jersey.....			538.2	126
349	356	128	145.9	1,159
New Mexico.....			119.1	31
95	317	104	11.0	351

New York.....	2,658.4	433	
1,197 512 185	556.1		1,285
North Carolina.....	353.4	131	
335 225 88	57.7		441
North Dakota.....	28.1	7	
19 360 127	3.7		569
Ohio.....	980.5	258	
719 317 114	104.3		404
Oklahoma.....	172.0	49	
138 296 104	38.8		800
Oregon.....	202.4	43	
118 396 143	38.2		897
Pennsylvania.....	917.7	205	
608 372 126	106.2		517
Puerto Rico.....	76.8	61	
190 105 34	14.4		237
Rhode Island.....	134.2	22	
62 504 181	6.2		279
South Carolina.....	118.0	53	
147 184 67	18.9		355
South Dakota.....	25.0	7	
20 289 104	3.6		500
Tennessee.....	219.8	108	
311 170 59	37.4		347
Texas.....	532.3	279	
782 159 57	79.9		287
Utah.....	78.0	18	
53 353 124	16.0		870
Vermont.....	65.7	10	
29 548 192	5.0		500
Virgin Islands.....	3.5	1	
4 243 77	0.8		667
Virginia.....	231.2	74	
194 261 99	44.7		607
Washington.....	605.5	101	
288 498 175	67.4		665
West Virginia.....	121.6	41	

119	245	85	7.0	169
Wisconsin.....			441.2	80
237	460	155	46.3	579
Wyoming.....			26.5	7
18	340	121	3.7	569

U.S. total.....			22,286	4,981
14,144	373	131	2,955.5	593

\1\Administrative costs include Child Care administration, Work Program, ADP, FAMIS, Fraud Control, SAVE, and other State and local administrative expenditures.

\2\Average annual administrative cost per family.

Source: Office of Financial Management, Administration for Children and Families.

TABLE 10-23.--AFDC-UP RECIPIENTS OF CASH PAYMENTS AND AMOUNTS OF PAYMENTS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1993
(PRELIMINARY DATA)

Average money payments (thousands)	Average monthly number of families	Average monthly number of recipients State	Average monthly payment per-- Family	UP Recipient
Alabama.....				
\$386	495	1,948	\$65	\$17
Alaska.....				
21,211	2,026	9,293	872	190

Arizona.....				
4,730	1,318	5,548	299	71
Arkansas.....				
1,458	399	1,688	305	72
California.....				
1,148,349	141,584	576,161	676	166
Colorado.....				
3,667	1,309	3,363	233	91
Connecticut.....				
17,269	2,200	9,293	654	155
Delaware.....				
476	121	500	328	79
District of Columbia.....				
1,343	173	862	647	130
Florida.....				
25,507	6,120	24,020	347	88
Georgia.....				
3,801	1,019	4,237	311	75
Guam.....				
1,006	111	614	755	137
Hawaii.....				
8,308	887	4,269	781	162
Idaho.....				
2,096	472	1,982	370	88
Illinois.....				
44,223	10,036	43,593	367	85
Indiana.....				
15,114	3,858	16,751	326	75
Iowa.....				
11,357	2,200	9,069	430	104
Kansas.....				
12,081	2,450	10,297	411	98
Kentucky.....				
28,603	9,000	36,281	265	66
Louisiana.....				
2,794	1,091	4,802	213	48
Maine.....				

17,765	2,656	11,152	557	133
Maryland.....				
4,838	967	4,211	417	96
Massachusetts.....				
45,435	6,525	27,773	580	136
Michigan.....				
184,379	31,585	134,236	486	114
Minnesota.....				
49,817	6,936	32,680	599	127
Mississippi.....				
263	158	623	139	35
Missouri.....				
20,053	5,142	22,104	325	76
Montana.....				
6,148	1,163	5,113	441	100
Nebraska.....				
6,065	1,283	5,524	394	91
Nevada.....				
1,397	357	1,495	326	78
New Hampshire.....				
2,941	548	2,332	447	105
New Jersey.....				
24,161	4,676	19,644	431	102
New Mexico.....				
8,859	1,779	8,272	415	89
New York.....				
116,487	17,063	70,715	569	137
North Carolina.....				
9,815	3,057	12,098	268	68
North Dakota.....				
2,583	489	2,154	440	100
Ohio.....				
11,531	23,939	96,869	388	96
Oklahoma.....				
3,315	698	2,945	396	94
Oregon.....				
21,240	3,929	16,038	450	110
Pennsylvania.....				

52,701	10,471	44,864	419	98
Rhode Island.....				
4,823	703	2,867	572	140
South Carolina.....				
1,984	867	3,398	191	49
South Dakota.....				
119	31	153	320	65
Tennessee.....				
11,365	4,494	13,474	211	70
Texas.....				
19,739	7,836	33,251	210	49
Utah.....				
1,031	192	853	447	101
Vermont.....				
9,589	1,427	5,781	560	138
Virginia.....				
2,878	767	3,237	313	74
Washington.....				
118,554	16,051	68,095	616	145
West Virginia.....				
29,272	8,171	32,778	299	74
Wisconsin.....				
54,023	7,995	38,693	563	116
Wyoming.....				
816	185	755	368	90

--

U.S. total.....				
2,297,765	359,009	1,488,748	533	129

Source: Office of Financial Management, Administration for Children and Families.

TABLE 10-24.--HISTORICAL TRENDS IN AFDC
ENROLLMENTS AND AVERAGE PAYMENTS

```

-----
-----
number of (in thousands)                Average monthly
                                         Average monthly

-----
----- benefit

Unemployed -----
      Fiscal year      Families\1\  Recipients\1\
Children\1\  Unemployed  parent

parent      recipients  Family  Recipient

families
-----
-----
1970..... 1,909 7,429
5,494      78      420    $178    $46
1971..... 2,532 9,556
6,963      143     726     180     48
1972..... 2,918 10,632
7,698      134     639     187     51
1973..... 3,123 11,038
7,965      120     557     187     53
1974..... 3,170 10,845
7,824      95      434     194     57

1975..... 3,342 11,067
7,928      101     451     210     63
1976..... 3,561 11,339
8,156      135     593     226     71
1977..... 3,575 11,108
7,818      149     659     242     78
1978..... 3,528 10,663
7,475      127     567     250     83
1979..... 3,493 10,311
7,193      113     504     257     87

1980..... 3,642 10,597
7,320      141     612     274     94

```

1981.....			3,871	11,160
7,615	209	881	277	96
1982.....			3,569	10,431
6,975	232	976	300	103
1983.....			3,651	10,659
7,051	272	1,144	311	106
1984.....			3,725	10,866
7,153	287	1,222	322	110
1985.....			3,692	10,813
7,165	261	1,131	339	116
1986.....			3,747	10,995
7,294	253	1,101	352	120
1987.....			3,784	11,065
7,381	236	1,035	359	123
1988.....			3,748	10,920
7,326	210	929	370	127
1989.....			3,771	10,935
7,370	193	856	381	131
1990.....			3,974	11,460
7,755	204	899	389	135
1991.....			4,375	12,595
8,515	268	1,148	388	135
1992.....			4,769	13,625
9,225	322	1,348	389	136
1993.....			4,981	14,144
9,539	359	1,489	373	131
1994\2\.....			5,055	14,336
9,681	346	1,433	374	132
1995\2\.....			5,148	14,551
9,859	338	1,398	376	133
1996\2\.....			5,252	14,809
10,058	331	1,365	380	135
1997\2\.....			5,363	15,093
10,271	327	1,344	385	137
1998\2\.....			5,460	15,344
10,456	323	1,326	391	139
1999\2\.....			5,575	15,649
10,677	321	1,316	398	142

\1\Includes unemployed parent families and, for 1971-81,
foster care children.

\2\Administration projection under current law.

Note.--AFDC benefit amounts have not been reduced by child
support collections.

Source: Office of Financial Management, Administration for
Children and Families.

TABLE 10-25.--TOTAL
AFDC BENEFIT EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEARS 1985-93\1\

[In millions]

Percent

1986	1987	1988	1989	1985	
1992	1993	real change		1990	1991

1985-93\2\

Alabama.....				\$70.6	
\$68.3	\$64.8	\$62.1	\$61.1	\$61.5	
\$67.5	\$85.1	\$95.5	0		
Alaska.....				42.1	
46.0	51.0	53.7	54.8	59.5	76.8
96.3	110.6	95			
Arizona.....				65.3	
78.6	93.9	103.3	117.0	138.4	177.8
242.6	268.7	206			
Arkansas.....				41.3	
48.4	49.8	53.3	55.4	57.0	60.0

61.1	59.8	8			
California.....				3,364.3	
3,573.6	3,869.2	4,091.0	4,436.5	4,954.9	
5,519.8	5,828.3	5,855.0	29		
Colorado.....				100.2	
106.6	117.5	125.1	131.0	136.7	
149.9	162.5	164.0	22		
Connecticut.....				223.2	
223.4	221.0	218.4	241.4	295.2	
347.2	376.9	386.3	29		
Delaware.....				26.4	
24.7	24.2	24.2	25.1	28.7	32.6
37.3	39.7	12			
District of Columbia.....				76.6	
76.5	77.7	76.2	77.5	84.0	97.5
102.4	112.6	9			
Florida.....				247.9	
261.3	291.7	318.1	354.6	417.5	
515.1	733.1	804.7	141		
Georgia.....				197.9	
222.8	243.8	265.8	289.3	320.7	
376.4	420.3	432.1	62		
Guam.....				2.7	
4.1	3.6	3.3	3.1	5.0	7.1
7.8	9.2	153			
Hawaii.....				78.6	
73.3	68.4	77.2	89.1	98.8	107.9
125.3	143.4	36			
Idaho.....				19.2	
19.3	20.2	19.3	18.4	19.5	22.2
24.0	28.5	10			
Illinois.....				869.1	
885.8	872.9	814.8	786.5	838.7	
892.2	882.6	882.9	-25		
Indiana.....				153.2	
147.5	146.2	167.3	162.2	169.9	
193.2	218.2	224.8	9		
Iowa.....				159.6	

169.7	166.4	155.0	149.0	152.4	
160.2	164.3	163.3	-24		
Kansas.....				85.1	
91.2	96.4	97.3	104.3	105.1	108.7
119.2	125.9	10			
Kentucky.....				138.1	
104.4	137.6	142.9	155.4	179.1	
204.1	213.1	210.0	13		
Louisiana.....				154.1	
161.5	172.8	182.2	184.8	188.0	
188.1	181.8	176.9	-15		
Maine.....				78.1	
84.0	82.4	79.8	86.1	101.3	113.2
118.3	117.1	11			
Maryland.....				121.6	
249.7	250.3	250.2	265.5	295.8	
330.4	333.3	316.5	93		
Massachusetts.....				416.8	
470.8	515.3	557.9	592.2	630.3	
665.6	750.9	749.9	34		
Michigan.....				1,197.9	
1,247.8	1,201.0	1,231.4	1,226.4	1,211.3	
1,184.1	1,162.0	1,190.1	-26		
Minnesota.....				308.3	
322.3	334.4	337.8	343.4	355.0	
370.7	387.0	384.0	-7		
Mississippi.....				60.7	
74.0	80.7	85.3	84.9	86.3	87.9
88.8	86.9	6			
Missouri.....				195.3	
208.6	212.7	214.7	220.0	228.0	
250.6	273.9	283.8	8		
Montana.....				32.1	
36.8	40.4	41.4	40.6	40.4	42.0
45.7	49.1	14			
Nebraska.....				58.3	
61.5	60.4	56.3	56.6	58.6	61.2
65.3	65.6	-16			
Nevada.....				11.7	

15.7	16.3	20.4	24.2	27.2	32.1
41.0	44.0	179			
New Hampshire.....				20.4	
19.6	18.1	21.1	24.3	31.8	45.3
54.5	56.0	104			
New Jersey.....				251.3	
509.0	482.8	458.7	440.1	451.4	
488.7	515.7	538.2	59		
New Mexico.....				51.1	
51.3	55.9	56.2	55.0	60.6	86.2
105.9	119.1	73			
New York.....				2,021.4	
2,098.6	2,097.9	2,140.1	2,153.7	2,254.4	
2,480.9	2,927.2	2,658.4	-2		
North Carolina.....				160.9	
137.6	191.0	205.6	220.5	246.7	
303.6	335.3	353.4	63		
North Dakota.....				18.2	
19.9	20.9	21.9	24.0	24.3	25.0
27.5	28.1	15			
Ohio.....				759.9	
803.5	810.1	805.3	826.6	877.2	
935.1	984.0	980.5	-4		
Oklahoma.....				87.8	
100.2	111.5	118.5	124.3	132.1	
152.2	169.2	172.0	46		
Oregon.....				106.5	
120.4	119.1	128.1	137.5	145.2	
177.2	200.1	202.4	41		
Pennsylvania.....				750.6	
388.8	750.9	746.8	738.5	798.3	
827.3	906.1	917.7	-9		
Puerto Rico.....				N.A.	
33.0	66.4	66.7	70.6	71.5	75.2
76.9	76.8	N.A.			
Rhode Island.....				73.4	
78.8	80.9	81.6	85.8	99.0	117.2
128.4	134.2	36			

South Carolina.....					89.5
103.2	102.7	91.2	91.3		95.7
107.4	119.2	118.0	-2		
South Dakota.....					